UNITED
NATIONS

A

General Assembly

Distr.
GENERAL

A/46/346
30 August 1991
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: ARABIC/ENGLISH/
SPANISH

Forty-sixth session
Item 127 of the provisional agenda*

MEASURES TO PREVENT INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM WHICH ENDANGERS OR TAKES INNOCENT HUMAN LIVES OR JEOPARDIZES FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS AND STUDY OF THE UNDERLYING CAUSES OF THOSE FORMS OF TERRORISM AND ACTS OF VIOLENCE WHICH LIE IN MISERY, FRUSTRATION, GRIEVANCE AND DESPAIR AND WHICH CAUSE SOME PEOPLE TO SACRIFICE HUMAN LIVES, INCLUDING THEIR OWN, IN AN ATTEMPT TO EFFECT RADICAL CHANGES:

(a) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL;

(b) CONVENING, UNDER THE AUSPICES OF THE UNITED NATIONS, OF AN INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE TO DEFINE TERRORISM AND TO DIFFERENTIATE IT FROM THE STRUGGLE OF PEOPLES FOR NATIONAL LIBERATON

Report of the Secretary-General

CONTENTS

		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION	4
II.	REPLIES RECEIVED FROM GOVERNMENTS	5
	Bolivia	5
	Canada	5
	Chile	6
	Colombia	9

* A/46/150.

CONTENTS (continued)

Page

Czechoslovakia 11

Ecuador 12

El Salvador 13

Honduras 14

Israel 14

Jamaica 15

Libyan Arab Jamahiriya 15

Malta 16

Papua New Guinea 17

Poland 17

Sri Lanka 19

Sweden 21

Syrian Arab Republic 22

Turkey 23

III. REPLIES RECEIVED FROM INTERGOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS 25

International Maritime Organization 25

World Tourism Organization 32

International Atomic Energy Agency 33

ANNEX

State, as at 16 July 1991, of signatures of, and ratifications of or accessions to, international conventions relating to various aspects of the problem of international terrorism 34

A. Conventions in respect of which the Secretary-General of the United Nations performs depository functions 34

CONTENTS (continued)

Page

1. Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 14 December 1973 34

2. International Convention against the Taking of Hostages, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 17 December 1979 37

B. Conventions in respect of which the International Civil Aviation Organization, the International Maritime Organization, the International Atomic Energy Agency, or some Member States perform depository functions 39

1. Convention on Offences and Certain Other Acts Committed on Board Aircraft, signed at Tokyo on 14 September 1963 .. 39

2. Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Seizure of Aircraft, signed at The Hague on 16 December 1970 47

3. Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Civil Aviation, signed at Montreal on 23 September 1971 53

4. Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material, adopted at Vienna on 3 March 1980 60

5. Protocol for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts of Violence at Airports Serving International Civil Aviation, supplementary to the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Civil Aviation, signed at Montreal on 24 February 1988 65

6. Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Maritime Navigation, done at Rome on 10 March 1988 69

7. Protocol for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Fixed Platforms located on the Continental Shelf, done at Rome on 10 March 1988 71

8. Convention on the Marking of Plastic Explosives for the Purpose of Detection, signed at Montreal on 1 March 1991 . 73

I. INTRODUCTION

1. On 4 December 1989, the General Assembly adopted resolution 44/29 entitled:

> "Measures to prevent international terrorism which endangers or takes innocent human lives or jeopardizes fundamental freedoms and study of the underlying causes of those forms of terrorism and acts of violence which lie in misery, frustration, grievance and despair and which cause some people to sacrifice human lives, including their own, in an attempt to effect radical changes:
>
> "(a) Report of the Secretary-General;
>
> "(b) Convening, under the auspices of the United Nations, of an international conference to define terrorism and to differentiate it from the struggle of peoples for national liberation".

The present report is submitted pursuant to paragraphs 14, 15 and 16 of the resolution.

2. By a note verbale dated 9 March 1990, the Secretary-General, pursuant to paragraphs 14 and 15 of the resolution, invited Governments of Member States to communicate to him views on international terrorism in all its aspects and on ways and means of combating it, including, inter alia, the convening, under the auspices of the United Nations, of an international conference to deal with international terrorism and views on the ways and means of enhancing the role of the United Nations and the relevant specialized agencies in combating international terrorism, as well as on proposals made during the debate on that item in the Sixth Committee at the forty-fourth session of the General Assembly.

3. By a letter dated 2 March 1990, the Legal Counsel also invited specialized agencies and the International Atomic Energy Agency to communicate to him any information or other relevant material deemed to be appropriate for inclusion in the report of the Secretary-General requested under paragraph 16 of resolution 44/29.

4. As at 7 August 1991 replies had been received from the Governments of Bolivia, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, El Salvador, Honduras, Israel, Jamaica, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malta, Papua New Guinea, Poland, Sri Lanka, Sweden (on behalf of the Nordic countries), Syrian Arab Republic and Turkey. Replies had also been received from the International Maritime Organization, the World Tourism Organization, and the International Atomic Energy Agency.

5. The present report reproduces the replies received from the above-mentioned Governments and organizations.

6. Any additional replies that are received will be published in addenda to the present report.

II. REPLIES RECEIVED FROM GOVERNMENTS

BOLIVIA

[Original: Spanish]

[18 March 1991]

1. The Government of Bolivia, taking note of paragraph 14 of General Assembly resolution 44/29, endorses the suggestion whereby an international conference should be convened, under the auspices of the United Nations, to consider a draft convention against terrorism, for the sole purpose of ending all acts, methods and practices of international terrorism.

2. Meanwhile, with respect to paragraph 5 of the aforementioned resolution, the Government of Bolivia is carefully studying the possibility of acceding to international conventions currently in force which relate to various aspects of international terrorism.

CANADA

[Original: English]

[24 April 1991]

1. The frequency and lethal impact of criminal acts of a terrorist character have increased in recent years. As a result, innocent persons are exposed to the danger of indiscriminate violence. The phenomenon has grown in geographical scope, as well as in the number and dramatic nature of the cases.

2. Terrorism is not likely to diminish in intensity in the near future, unless more effective cooperation is established. A global system of competitive arms sales makes modern weapons more easily available to terrorist groups; mass communications assure instantaneous publicity for terrorist acts, thus accomplishing one of the main terrorist objectives; and travel between different countries has become easier. All these factors facilitate the commission of terrorist acts. Under these circumstances, closer international cooperation of all entities involved in the struggle against terrorism are indispensable components of effective anti-terrorist policies and strategies. Furthermore, the role of the mass media in recruiting the assistance and cooperation of the population, while denying the terrorists the sensationalist publicity that is one of their objectives, could be of critical importance in this respect.

3. Canada does not consider that an international conference to define terrorism or its underlying causes should be convened, as such a debate is likely to be highly politicized and counter-productive. Instead, it would be preferable to identify conduct which the international community deems

unacceptable and to develop measures to prevent and control such conduct. We prefer an approach that concentrates on establishing practical legal, political and security measures to deal with the manifestations of terrorism, whatever the motivation.

CHILE

[Original: Spanish]

[17 July 1991]

1. The Government of Chile unequivocally condemns terrorism in all its forms and manifestations, irrespective of the place in which terrorist acts occur, of the persons who perpetrate them or of the causes or motives for their commission.

2. Acts of terrorism affect the life, health, property and safety of innocent persons; endanger the operation and stability of democratic institutions; seriously damage the productive infrastructure and economic activity of States; and destabilize the international situation, creating new areas of tension and provoking international conflicts.

3. By its use of cruelty for the purpose of instilling fear, terrorism causes harm which goes beyond the immediate victim, affecting the whole society and threatening all mankind, a fact which necessitates its condemnation and international cooperation to combat it, and precludes any justification, no matter how legitimate its underlying cause.

4. According to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world. Thus, the battle against terrorism must be fought with strict adherence to the norms which characterize States subject to the rule of law and with full respect for human rights, particularly the right to due process and to personal integrity.

5. In this context, in the internal sphere, the democratic Government of Chile promoted the passage of Act No. 19,027, promulgated on 24 January 1991, amending Act No. 18,314, which defines terrorist practices and establishes penalties for them. This reform broadens the definition of terrorist methods and rationalizes and increases the penalties, but at the same time establishes norms which guarantee due process for persons detained and prosecuted for terrorism. Thus, anti-terrorist legislation has not only been refined but has also been made consistent with the contents of international instruments on the protection of human rights.

6. According to the aforementioned amendment, the first determining factor which denotes terrorist activity under its new definition is that the offence is committed for the purpose of producing in all or part of the population a

justified fear of becoming the victim of similar crimes; the amendment establishes a legal presumption to that effect when the crime is committed using explosive or incendiary devices, weapons of great destructive power, substances which are toxic, corrosive or infectious or which may cause serious damage, or the sending of letters, packages or similar objects having explosive or toxic effects.

7. The second determining factor is that the criminal act is committed with the aim of forcing a settlement by the authorities or imposing demands on them.

8. In addition, a wider variety of criminal acts, when they evince the aforementioned factors or conditions, are punished according to the penalties established in the Penal Code and the State Security Act, but are aggravated by one, two or three degrees.

9. Moreover, the amendment establishes measures which the administrative authorities may take to prevent terrorism. Thus, subject to justified legal authorization and for not more than 30 days, communications may be intercepted, opened or recorded and suspicious persons may be placed under surveillance. Abuse of these powers by public officials is punishable by temporary disqualification from public offices or posts.

10. The accused may be confined in special public facilities; his communications may be intercepted and his visits, other than those of his lawyer, may be restricted. Negligence by the judge in protecting the physical integrity of the prisoner through medical examinations is punishable as a dereliction of duty.

11. Furthermore, in the legislative sphere, the National Congress is in the process of elaborating draft laws which would provide for the surrender and renunciation on the part of terrorist groups and their dissolution. Also under consideration is a special prison regime for terrorist offenders. Lastly, the President of the Republic has granted pardons - which do not apply to persons convicted of violent crimes - for acts committed prior to the inauguration of the democratic Government on 11 March 1990.

12. In the political sphere, the Government has established a Public Security Commission, responsible for processing intelligence information on terrorism. This information is conveyed to the operative bodies in charge of preventing and combating terrorism (the Carabineros de Chile and the Policía de Investigaciones).

13. The Commission directly advises the President of the Republic and is under the authority of the Ministry of Interior.

14. Aware that terrorist acts undermine the democratic system, the Government is also considering signing an anti-terrorist covenant aimed at the political isolation of terrorist groups through an all-party consensus.

15. Internationally, Chile is a party to the following international instruments on terrorism:

(a) Convention on Offences and Certain Other Acts Committed on Board Aircraft, signed at Tokyo in 1963;

(b) Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Seizure of Aircraft, signed at The Hague in 1970;

(c) Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Civil Aviation, concluded at Montreal in 1971, and its Supplementary Protocol for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts of Violence at Airports Serving International Civil Aviation, signed at Montreal in 1988;

(d) Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents, adopted in New York in 1973;

(e) International Convention against the Taking of Hostages, adopted in New York in 1979.

16. In addition, the following instruments are in course of approval by the National Congress preparatory to their ratification:

(a) Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Maritime Navigation, done at Rome in 1988; and

(b) Protocol for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Fixed Platforms located on the Continental Shelf, done at Rome in 1988.

17. The Government of Chile is convinced that the accession of all States to these international instruments and the strict observance of their stipulations will help to create favourable conditions for preventing terrorism and fighting it effectively, especially in view of their primary goal, that is, to deny safe havens to terrorists.

18. The Government of Chile considers that the investigation of terrorist acts and their prevention and punishment are inalienable powers and duties of the State which have an international dimension to the extent that States must cooperate among themselves to apprehend the perpetrators of such acts or to prevent their occurrence.

19. The treatment of terrorist acts should not be confused with that of violations of human rights, since the entire international system of protection of human rights recognizes the State as an element of the basic legal relationship.

20. In that connection, and with regard to the very concept of violation of human rights, it should be recalled that, according to the International Court of Justice in its advisory opinion on Namibia in 1971, 1/ a violation of human

rights is an infringement of international human rights treaties committed by the State and its officials.

21. Chile, accordingly, conscious of the need for a coordinated and concerted response to terrorism in all its forms, regardless of its origins, causes or goals, is in favour of intensifying international cooperation, whether on a world scale or at the regional and bilateral level, through the conclusion of new agreements and by putting in place international mechanisms for cooperation and for prosecution and policing. The aim of such measures would be to increase Governments' capacity to prevent acts of terrorism, to detain and to prosecute suspects, or failing that, to grant extradition of any persons known or suspected to have committed such acts.

22. Lastly, as for the suggestion that the United Nations might convene an international conference to define terrorism and to differentiate it from peoples' struggle for national liberation, it should be emphasized that past experience and the present situation both go to show that either to define it or to establish universal standards in that regard would require a degree of maturity that the international community has not yet attained. Too many completely different doctrines and concepts coexist, principally with respect to whether certain behaviour constitutes an act of terrorism and what exceptions should be made.

23. Despite that, the Government of Chile considers that the United Nations should continue to act as the appropriate forum, both to foster international cooperation and to promote debate and study of the phenomenon of terrorism through seminars and other events. It is essential for new aspects of that phenomenon to be taken into account, such as the growing links between terrorist groups and drug traffickers with their paramilitary gangs.

COLOMBIA

[Original: Spanish]

[13 March 1991]

1. Colombia welcomes the efforts being made by the United Nations to deal with the question of international terrorism, as demonstrated by the fact that, at the forty-fourth session of the General Assembly, resolution 44/29 was adopted without a vote. This is undoubtedly an achievement which reflects the proposed new spirit of international understanding which will stimulate our future work with a view to achieving common benefits, leaving aside confrontation between hegemonistic blocs or subjection to actions based on the use of force and violence which may endanger international peace and security.

2. In accordance with that concern, our Government considers that the forty-sixth session of the General Assembly could be an auspicious time for evaluating the international events that have occurred between 1989, when resolution 44/29 was adopted and a fruitful debate was held within the Organization, and 1991.

3. Colombia has been a victim of the most violent and varied terrorist practices. We have endured the painful consequences of actions executed by individuals financed by the traffic in drugs who, supported by arms dealers and trained by mercenaries, have together sought to undermine the constitutional order of the State and society and also such fundamental human rights as freedom of expression and freedom to engage in political activity and who have sought to paralyse the administration of justice by means of intimidation and assassination.

4. At the same time, our population has been subjected to repeated bomb blasts and acts of violence committed by guerrilla groups which have demonstrated their disregard for human life whether of children, farmers, or representatives of the legitimately constituted authorities and other national institutions when carrying out their acts. This senseless attitude does not correspond to the peace efforts put forward by the Government or to the political spaces which have been created to enable such groups to play an active role in the process of national reconciliation and in the formulation of their proposals in the Constitutional Assembly convened by the people. The Assembly includes former militants of guerrilla movements who have had sufficient political vision to choose the path of peace for the comparison of ideas rather than the dialectical path of weapons and violence.

5. By blowing up oil pipelines, the terrorists have considerably affected the national economy, thereby limiting the resources which can be utilized for the common good and for maintaining the level of expenditure required in order to deal with the battle against drug trafficking, the economic power of which is acknowledged. This situation has occurred just at the time when oil prices are subject to fluctuations because of the events in the Gulf. Our concern is all the greater because of the disastrous effects this has had on water and land ecosystems in areas in which nature has been preserved as a model of environmental protection.

6. For all the above-stated reasons, the Colombian Government reaffirms its position that terrorism is a practice which must be condemned in all its manifestations, whatever its origin and wherever it occurs, East or West, North or South. In cases of terrorism linked to drug traffickers, mercenaries and arms dealers, the condemnation extends not only to those who commit the terrorist acts but also to those who provide the inspiration, guidance or training for them; those who do nothing when they could prevent these acts from occurring are just as responsible as those who commit the acts.

7. That situation prompts us to express concern regarding those countries which are not doing enough to prevent the traffic in arms and the training of terrorists. None the less, Colombia remains firm in the battle it has engaged against drug trafficking. Accordingly, we appeal to the international community so that we may act together to prevent mercenaries and weapons originating in countries that benefit from Colombia's battle against drugs from becoming factors of disruption at the national and international levels. The situation has been clearly stated in the 1990 report of the International Narcotics Control Board of the United Nations which states that "trafficking

organizations, often in conjunction with terrorists, continue to forge links within countries, within regions and interregionally". 2/ It goes on to state that "the response of the international community to the traffickers must be even more forceful, more comprehensive, more innovative". 3/

8. In addition, the Colombian Government would like to reiterate the importance of calling on the international community to establish a legal instrument which would define terrorism and harmonize the concepts so as to underscore the international responsibility of States for controlling at home the means, systems and individuals who encourage violence in other territories. At the same time, it would be worthwhile proposing sanction mechanisms which would ensue from the international responsibility borne by those States which promote, stimulate, or support the crime of terrorism, whether directly for political and commercial reasons or indirectly by facilitating the sale and marketing of weapons, explosives and devices used for terrorist purposes, without any type of control over or knowledge of their real final destination. The convening of an international conference for that purpose could be an exceptional opportunity for dealing with that issue.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

[Original: English]

[23 April 1991]

1. The Czech and Slovak Federal Republic resolutely condemns international terrorism in all forms and manifestations. Nothing can justify forcible acts of terrorism.

2. Czechoslovakia attaches a great significance to cooperation of States in combating international terrorism, as well as to the extension of the number of treaty parties to international conventions on the various aspects of the problem of international terrorism. Czechoslovakia is party to the Convention on Offences and Certain Other Acts Committed on Board Aircraft, signed at Tokyo on 14 September 1963; to the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Seizure of Aircraft, signed at The Hague, on 16 December 1970; to the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Civil Aviation, concluded at Montreal on 23 September 1971; to the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents, adopted in New York on 14 December 1973; to the International Convention against the Taking of Hostages adopted at New York on 17 December 1979; and to the Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material signed at Vienna on 3 March 1980.

3. In the past period, on 19 March 1990, Czechoslovakia ratified the Protocol for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts of Violence at Airports Serving International Civil Aviation, supplementary to the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Civil Aviation adopted at Montreal on 24 February 1988.

4. Czechoslovakia also signed on 8 March 1989, the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Maritime Navigation and the Protocol for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Fixed Platforms located on the Continental Shelf, adopted at Rome on 10 March 1988. At present, Czechoslovakia is preparing for approval and ratification of the two above-mentioned international accords.

5. Jointly with the United Kingdom, Czechoslovakia was at the birth of an initiative aimed at the struggle against the misuse of plastic explosives for terrorist and other illegal purposes. Therefore, it especially welcomes the success constituted by the adoption of the Convention on the Marking of Plastic Explosives for the Purpose of Detection at the International Conference on Air Law, held under the auspices of the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) at Montreal from 2 February to 1 March 1991. Czechoslovakia signed the Convention on 1 March 1991 and is taking the necessary steps at present for its speedy approval.

6. Czechoslovakia is expanding its cooperation with other States in the struggle against dangerous criminal activities, including terrorist acts, at both bilateral and multilateral levels. It was admitted into membership of the International Criminal Police Organization (Interpol) at the fifty-ninth meeting of the Interpol General Assembly held at Ottawa from 27 September to 3 October 1990.

7. As regards the convening of an international conference to define terrorism and to distinguish it from the struggle of nations for liberation. Czechoslovakia is of the opinion that such a conference might be useful only if it had general support and could help resolve the problem of international terrorism. Czechoslovakia has serious doubts whether a generally acceptable definition of terrorism could be worked out at the present stage. Consequently, it prefers at the present time a strengthening of the international obligations of States in combating and punishing concrete forms and manifestations of terrorist activities.

ECUADOR

[Original: Spanish]

[7 February 1991]

1. Ecuador traditionally has supported the struggle of the peoples under colonial regimes and other forms of alien domination, considering that this practice constitutes the exercise of the principle of self-determination of peoples.

2. Ecuador's foreign policy condemns terrorism in all its forms, regarding it as a flagrant violation of the fundamental rights of the individual and a threat to the stability of nations. Ecuador believes that terrorism should be universally condemned and likewise combated by all the legal means possible.

3. The Government of Ecuador considers that the Secretary-General of the United Nations should act as a channel for the expression of the views of Member States in order to secure the implementation of the necessary legal measures for preventing and combating terrorism in all its forms.

4. Once basic common elements of understanding have been determined, Ecuador will support the holding of an international conference, under the auspices of the United Nations, to define terrorism, in accordance with the proposal referred to in sub-item (b) of General Assembly resolution 44/29.

EL SALVADOR

[Original: Spanish]

[16 July 1990]

The comments of the Government of El Salvador on General Assembly resolution 44/29, made by the Minister of Justice, Mr. Oscar Alfredo Santamaria, are as follows:

> "There is no question that in the various regional or interregional meetings held on the matter, exhaustive consideration has been given to the aspects involving the underlying causes of terrorism and the aspects that concur accidentally to promote terrorism and its well-known spread.
>
> "As a logical consequence, recommendations have been formulated for measures to be implemented that will combat organized criminality that is controlled on a broad international scale, and it is reasonable to expect that they should be applied or put into practice to the extent possible.
>
> "I have been given a mandate that includes the obligation to try to put into effect the recommendations and conclusions of the meeting held. My activities will be directed towards improving or going beyond the existing classification of offences in the system of penal legislation, by defining conduct constituting offences which belong either to the category of offences properly so called, or are circumstances involving a co-causality that might aggravate criminal participation, such as receiving, acquiring or employing monies or goods derived from illicit trafficking in drugs and their use or intended use to increase or carry out terrorist acts.
>
> "In addition, cooperative links must be set up through specialized national anti-terrorist agencies or bodies for the exchange of appropriate techniques or methods with foreign organizations in order to counteract the said criminal activity.

"As a corollary, it is also indispensable to establish bodies whose purpose is in part to make a continual and systematic scientific study of the possible internal and external causes that encourage terrorist acts; in short, bodies which, set up with well-defined aims, can accurately distinguish terrorist activity as such from other forms of struggle in which peoples seeking to overcome oppressive political systems are engaged.

"It should be mentioned in this note that the Ministry for which I am responsible is drafting a bill entitled 'Act establishing the National Crime Prevention Commission', whose aims include the study of terrorist acts and which will in future seek to sponsor and ensure the effectiveness of any kind of administrative policy aimed at actually applying the recommendations and conclusions of the various meetings held on the subject of pressing world problems such as the one here indicated."

HONDURAS

[Original: Spanish]

[16 May 1991]

The Government of Honduras has, in accordance with the international conventions in force and, specifically, with those concerning the various aspects of the problem of international terrorism, taken appropriate measures - in cooperation with the institutional bodies which have established our laws - to prevent and punish the criminal and unjustifiable expressions of a practice which is condemned by the society of nations. It also favours the idea of convening, under the auspices of the United Nations, an international conference to define the term in order that this heterogeneous phenomenon, which by the perpetration of repeated crimes, creates a state of alarm or fear in the community or in social or political groups, may be combated effectively.

ISRAEL

[Original: English]

[27 June 1991]

1. The Permanent Representative of Israel wishes to draw the attention of the Secretary-General to the statement delivered by the representative of Israel in the Sixth Committee of the United Nations General Assembly on 18 October 1989 (A/C.6/44/SR.21).

2. In that statement, the view was expressed that international cooperation should focus on three areas: strengthening and improvement of preventive security measures; strengthening of the conventional law enforcement framework; and comprehensive action against States which employ terror.

Israel believes that the Sixth Committee can play an important role in these efforts, by articulating norms and offering guidance and support to those international bodies which, by mandate and expertise, are best equipped to develop practical and durable answers to specific aspects of the problem.

3. Regarding the question of convening an international conference to "define terrorism and to differentiate it from the struggle of peoples for national liberation", Israel believes that such a conference can serve no positive purpose. Any attempt to legitimize acts of terror under the pretext of national liberation would be an affront to the victims of terrorism and to the United Nations as a whole.

4. Moreover, since there is no common approach to a definition of terrorism, any conference - and certainly one intended to qualify the definition through the proposed differentiation - can only lead to division. It would divert the international community's attention and energy from the real task of substantive cooperation in the fight against terrorism.

JAMAICA

[Original: English]

[14 June 1990]

The Government of Jamaica does not, at this time, have any further comments to add to those already made by its representatives in interventions during the meetings of the Sixth Committee in 1987 and 1988. The Government of Jamaica is, however, in favour of the convening, at an appropriate time, of an international conference on all aspects of international terrorism, including the question of the definition of terrorism.

LIBYAN ARAB JAMAHIRIYA

[Original: Arabic]

[28 March 1991]

1. The Great Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya attaches great importance to consideration of and action on the problem of terrorism. It has on many occasions expressed its profound anxiety at this dangerous phenomenon and has urged - and continues to urge - that the phenomenon be accorded due attention. The Jamahiriya feels that the dangers and consequences of terrorism affect the interests of all nations of the world: they not only threaten innocent human lives but also create tension in relations between States and undermine international peace and security.

2. The Great Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya has frequently affirmed that the United Nations must address the subject of terrorism and its reasons from a clear conceptual standpoint, establishing objective foundations: by doing so, it should prevent any infringement, violation or breach of the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations as a result of confusing acts of violence emanating from desires to fulfil criminal objectives with the struggle of national liberation movements to resist foreign invasion and occupation or to conduct their legitimate battle against attempts to impose hegemony, subjugation and policies of domination over peoples.

3. We are firmly convinced that the most heinous, comprehensive and widely practised form of violence is that of official, organized and programmed terrorism. This constitutes the highest degree of international terrorism, as practised deliberately and obstinately by certain States at the international level, or as seen in the encouragement of other States which they arm and foster with a view to carrying out acts of aggression and terrorism. This form of State terrorism is based on operations by a military force outside the borders of the State in question, using all forms of violence such as terrorism, killing and destruction, in order to subjugate and dominate peoples, thus offending against international laws and customs and contravening the purposes, principles and decisions of international organizations, and especially of the United Nations.

4. The correct approach in defining the legal concept of international terrorism is to identify solutions which will deter international terrorism by conducting an objective study of the causes for the emergence of this phenomenon and the underlying reasons for its increasing recurrence in recent years.

5. The Great Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya endorses the call to convene an international conference, under the auspices of the United Nations, to define terrorism and to differentiate it from the struggle of peoples for national liberation and is most hopeful that general agreement will be reached concerning the convening of the conference.

MALTA

[Original: English]

[5 March 1991]

1. Regarding aspects on the ways and means of combating international terrorism, there should be no objection to the suggestion of the holding of an international conference under the auspices of the United Nations to discuss terrorism in general, and the application of the various United Nations instruments referring to forms of terrorism and to concrete proposals how to make those instruments more effective. Perhaps the various regional authorities can be represented (the Council of Europe, in particular) to give their views.

2. Regarding Malta's views on the ways and means of enhancing the role of the United Nations and the relevant specialized agencies in combating international terrorism, as the United Nations is the only world forum it should set up a committee of legal and technical experts to explore the following proposal:

(a) The consolidation of all United Nations instruments relating to terrorism;

(b) The addition of new articles to the various conventions, if required;

(c) Technical know-how to combat terrorism more effectively.

PAPUA NEW GUINEA

[Original: English]

[14 January 1991]

1. Papua New Guinea will do everything within its powers to implement resolution 44/29 of 4 December 1989, in cooperation with other members of the South Pacific Forum, the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN), the Commonwealth and other international organizations.

2. Terrorism at national, regional and international levels are illegal, and not acceptable to the Government of Papua New Guinea.

POLAND

[Original: English]

[15 April 1991]

1. Poland shares the views of other States that international cooperation in combating and preventing terrorism shall contribute to the strengthening of confidence among States and to the creation of a better climate among them.

2. The United Nations and the specialized agencies play an important role in combating international terrorism. The United Nations, as a centre of research and law-making activities put forward by many countries, creates a fine climate for prevention of international terrorism. Poland condemns acts of international terrorism and sees no excuse whatsoever for acts of terror. Terrorism cannot be justified by any political reasons.

3. Once more, we would like to stress that cooperation among States is the principal factor in the suppression of international terrorism.

4. Poland is of the opinion that all terrorists should be immediately extradited to the State of which the interests or citizens have been the subject of terrorist acts.

5. Poland has undertaken various actions at the multilateral level for the purpose of establishing legal instruments for the prevention of terrorist acts. We have ratified or signed practically all multilateral conventions dealing with terrorism, namely:

(a) Convention on Offences and Certain Other Acts Committed on Board Aircraft, signed at Tokyo on 14 September 1963 (ratified in 1971);

(b) Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Seizure of Aircraft, signed at The Hague on 16 December 1970 (ratified in 1972);

(c) Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Civil Aviation, concluded at Montreal on 29 September 1971 (ratified in 1976);

(d) Convention on the Prevention of and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons including Diplomatic Agents, concluded in New York, on 14 December 1979 (ratified in 1983);

(e) Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Maritime Navigation, done at Rome on 10 March 1988 (in the process of ratification);

(f) Protocol for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Fixed Platforms located on the Continental Shelf, done at Rome on 10 March 1988 (in the process of ratification).

6. Poland is interested in the preparation of further international instruments for the purpose of suppressing terrorism under the auspices of the United Nations.

7. Poland has already established several working contacts with other countries in order to exchange experiences in methods of combating terrorism. We hosted experts from the United States and the United Kingdom. Close cooperation is maintained with the United States on this matter, particularly in the field of training personnel, exchange of information and equipment. Close ties have been established with France and Austria. Poland also expresses its interest in acceding to the existing relevant conventions of the Council of Europe.

8. The existing domestic legislation provides regulations relating to the punishment of acts of terror. The present Polish Penal Code contains provisions that penalize terrorist-related acts, such as:

- Perpetration of a catastrophe endangering human life;

- Illegal possession and storage of firearms and explosives;

- Placing the life of a person in direct jeopardy;

- Jeopardizing of the health of a person;

- Holding persons in captivity;

- Assault of persons enjoying diplomatic and other international protection.

9. The committee responsible for the preparation of the draft of the new Penal Code recognizes the importance of the problem of international terrorism and has therefore proposed regulations that would deal with that terrible phenomenon in a more effective manner. The draft has retained the penalization of the above-cited crimes, and at the same time has provided for the punishment of acts that can be easily qualified as of a terrorist nature. The draft recognizes the specific crime of taking hostages. The death of a hostage or injuries suffered by a hostage as a direct of the above-mentioned act is a qualified form of that crime. Severe punishment is provided for hijackers of aircrafts and ships. These examples illustrate the concern of legislators in respect to terrorism.

10. The Polish authorities have established separate police units that have been specially prepared for the suppression of terrorism. These forces have branches in principal Polish cities. They are responsible for the protection of important public facilities, especially airports and railroad stations. Diplomatic premises and personnel also enjoy special protection. These units are specially equipped for the above-mentioned purposes, and a large part of its members has undergone special training in the United States. Poland was one of the first countries to establish such units in 1976.

SRI LANKA

[Original: English]

[9 May 1991]

1. The Government of Sri Lanka welcomes resolution 44/29 adopted at the forty-fourth session of the United Nations General Assembly and attaches special importance to paragraph 4 (a) to (e) thereof, which urges all States to fulfil their obligations under international law and take effective measures for the elimination of international terrorism.

2. Manifestations of terrorism which involve an external factor or the presence of a foreign element, pose a grave threat to the security and stability of States, in particular small States. In certain instances, terrorism can affect the independence and territorial integrity of States. International cooperation in combating international terrorism should therefore specifically focus on the prevention of:

(a) The organization, instigation and assisting of terrorist acts from foreign territories directed at third States;

(b) The committing of terrorist acts within one State and seeking of a safe haven with a foreign State;

(c) The condoning of activities including fund-raising and the provision of arms and training which have the effect of sustaining or encouraging terrorism in other States.

3. These aspects of international terrorism could be effectively countered by the strict adherence by States to their obligations under international law to prevent the preparation and organization in their respective territories of terrorist and subversive acts directed against other States and to deny a safe haven in their territory to terrorists by ensuring the apprehension and prosecution or extradition of perpetrators of terrorist acts.

4. Sri Lanka also attaches special importance to regional initiatives to combat terrorism.

5. Pursuant to a decision by the South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC) to adopt measures to combat terrorism as it affects the security and stability of the region, the Government of Sri Lanka took the initiative in 1987 to convene at Colombo, a SAARC Meeting of Legal Experts to formulate a Regional Convention on Suppression of Terrorism. This Meeting finalized the text of a Convention which was adopted at the Third SAARC Summit at Kathmandu in 1987. The SAARC Convention on Suppression of Terrorism came into effect on 22 August 1988 after ratification by all member States of SAARC.

6. The principal provisions of the Convention provide for the following:

(a) Offences set forth in article I of the Convention which are offences most likely to be committed by terrorists are to be regarded as "non-political" for the purposes of extradition;

(b) An obligation on States parties to either extradite or prosecute terrorist offenders;

(c) Exercise of extraterritorial jurisdiction by national courts of member States with a view to prosecuting terrorist offenders where their extradition is not granted.

7. Sri Lanka has already enacted the SAARC Regional Convention on Suppression of Terrorism Act No. 70 of 1988 to give effect, at the domestic level, to its obligations under the SAARC Convention.

8. Sri Lanka has consistently stressed within the SAARC forum the importance of practical measures of cooperation among member States, as well as between their security agencies, in the fields of exchanging of information, intelligence, expertise and the providing of training facilities in the field

of anti-terrorist techniques. It has also proposed a meeting of experts of SAARC member countries to discuss the modalities for such cooperation.

9. Sri Lanka also supports the wide adherence to the existing international conventions on specific aspects of terrorism. Sri Lanka is a party to the Tokyo, Hague and Montreal Conventions on offences against aircraft. Most recently, Sri Lanka acceded to the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents, which entered into force for Sri Lanka on 29 March 1991. Sri Lanka is also examining the possibility of early accession to other Conventions on specific aspects of terrorism.

10. Sri Lanka signed on 11 October 1989 in London the Montreal Protocol for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts of Violence at Airports serving International Civil Aviation. The domestic legislation to enable Sri Lanka to ratify the Montreal Protocol is presently under preparation.

11. Sri Lanka welcomes the initiatives taken by the International Civil Aviation Organization and the International Maritime Organization for the development of the legal regime for the combating of acts of terrorism in the fields of civil aviation and maritime navigation.

12. The Government of Sri Lanka welcomes the proposals made at the forty-fourth session of the General Assembly on enhancing the role of the United Nations and the relevant specialized agencies in the combating of international terrorism and is of the view that those proposals deserve careful consideration.

13. The Government of Sri Lanka is of the view that early resolution of outstanding international political issues would greatly facilitate an international approach to combating terrorism.

14. Sri Lanka welcomes the proposal to reach early understanding on a generally agreed definition of international terrorism.

SWEDEN

(on behalf of the Nordic countries)

[Original: English]

[18 April 1991]

1. The five Nordic countries Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden have repeatedly condemned all acts, methods and practices of terrorism as criminal and totally unjustifiable under any circumstances, regardless of where and by whom they have been perpetrated. The principles laid down by the General Assembly on how to combat international terrorism and last reiterated in General Assembly resolution 44/29, adopted without a vote, have the complete and unreserved support of the Nordic countries.

2. Since the subject of international terrorism was discussed in the Sixth Committee and the General Assembly in the autumn of 1989, a number of terrorist acts have been committed. The fight against international terrorism must therefore continue. Encouragement to commit terrorist acts, as given for example in connection with the recent Gulf conflict, must be held as totally unacceptable. In this context, reference is made to paragraph 32 of Security Council resolution 687 of 3 April 1991.

3. In the fight against international terrorism, international cooperation is of the utmost importance. The five Nordic countries appreciate the work being done within the International Maritime Organization (IMO) and International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO). They particularly welcome the successful outcome of the International Conference on Air Law, held at ICAO headquarters in Montreal, which on 1 March 1991 resulted in the Convention on the Marking of Plastic Explosives for the Purpose of Detection. The Nordic countries will sign and ratify the Convention as soon as possible.

4. The five Nordic countries wish to reiterate their view that it would be impossible to find a satisfactory legal definition of international terrorism and that, for this reason, they do not favour the holding of an international conference, under the auspices of the United Nations, to define terrorism and to differentiate it from the struggle of peoples for national liberation.

5. During the 1989 United Nations discussions on international terrorism, some concrete proposals were put forward, e.g. the possible establishment of a terrorism fact-finding body or international terrorism centre within the United Nations. The Nordic countries are of the opinion that these matters need further study, taking into consideration the role of the United Nations and the need and the costs of creating such bodies.

SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC

[Original: Arabic]

[11 December 1990]

1. The Syrian Arab Republic condemns all forms of terrorism, which is directed against the lives and property of innocent people and violates the sovereignty of States. It calls for genuine cooperation among all countries in adopting those measures necessary to prevent its occurrence and eliminate its underlying causes. That can be brought about by the elaboration of precise and internationally accepted criteria by means of which the international community can differentiate clearly between terrorism, which must be condemned and opposed, and national struggle against foreign occupation, which must be protected and supported. The Syrian Arab Republic therefore welcomed the adoption by the General Assembly of its historic resolution 42/159, which took a step forward in expanding and promoting effective cooperation within a framework of international legitimacy in order to prevent international terrorism which endangers or takes innocent human

lives or jeopardizes fundamental freedoms; study the underlying causes of those forms of terrorism and acts of violence which lie in misery, frustration, grievance and despair; and affirm the right of peoples to self-determination and independence and the legitimacy of their struggle.

2. For the first time, it was considered that the convening of an international conference to define terrorism and differentiate between it and the struggle of peoples for national liberation was one of the ways and means of dealing with international terrorism.

3. The importance of General Assembly resolution 44/29, adopted without a vote, lies in the fact that the Assembly thereby confirmed the principles in question and considered that the convening of an international conference to define terrorism was indispensable in order to eliminate the deliberate confusion between terrorism and the struggle of peoples for national liberation and to bring an end to the campaign of falsification and intimidation being waged by certain States with a view to preventing peoples languishing under the yoke of foreign occupation from engaging in struggle in order to free themselves and restore their sovereignty and independence. At the same time, the resolution promotes international cooperation at all levels in order to combat terrorism, eradicate it and eliminate its evil, and places the international community on the right track for the elimination of a phenomenon which had devoured mankind for centuries.

4. The Syrian Arab Republic, which was first to raise the subject of convening an international conference to differentiate between terrorism and the struggle of peoples for national liberation, given its attitude of responsibility and its concern to protect international legitimacy and to affirm the principles of international law, commends the Secretary-General for his continued action in seeking the views of Member States on the convening of the conference and wishes him success in his efforts to implement the mandate entrusted to him under the terms of the relevant resolution.

TURKEY

[Original: English]

[24 April 1991]

1. Terrorism, which has evolved into a truly global problem over the past two decades, seems most likely to remain so for years to come. Terrorism is a grave violation of the basic human rights, that is, the right to life and the right to enjoy security under the rule of law.

2. Just as terrorism knows no borders, the fight against this scourge calls for international cooperation which in turn can be reinforced by bilateral and regional cooperation. This has become all the more necessary since terrorism poses a significant threat not only to individual countries, but also to world peace and stability by frequently constraining the orderly conduct of relations between States.

3. The present dimensions of international terrorism and the threat it poses for the international community necessitates a coordinated and concerted response to combat all forms of terrorism regardless of its origin, causes and purposes.

4. Turkey believes in the imperative of firmness in the strategy against terrorism. Concession of any nature, whether paying ransom, releasing convicted terrorists from prison, alteration of policies or the adoption of selective attitudes for the purpose of accommodating terrorist demands, are sources of encouragement for terrorism.

5. Turkey has always vigorously urged other countries to be firm with terrorists, for it believes that a solid international front is essential to overall success. The elimination of terrorism requires constant vigilance and increasingly effective international cooperation.

6. It should be noted with satisfaction that the international legal regime against terrorism continues to improve. Turkey, for its part, has always supported the development and rigorous application of international conventions elaborated under the auspices of the United Nations and related to various aspects of the problem of international terrorism.

7. Turkey's point of view on the proposal of "the convening, under the auspices of the United Nations, of an international conference to define terrorism and to differentiate it from the struggle of peoples for national liberation" is that, both subjects such a conference would cover are highly controversial. As regards the first subject, the insuperable difficulties inherent in finding an internationally recognized definition of terrorism should not be underestimated. In relation to the second subject, Turkey has unreservedly condemned, as criminal, all acts, methods and practices of terrorism, wherever and by whomever committed, including those which jeopardize friendly relations between States and their security, and believes that terrorism cannot be justified under any circumstances. Past experience suggests that a consensus by the international community on the two subjects to be dealt with at such a conference still rests beyond the realm of possibility. Consequently, the convening of such an international conference would serve no other purpose than reviving controversies which have in the past obstructed a convergence of views and might thus lead to the weakening of the international community's determination and to a slackening in its efforts to combat terrorism.

8. In principle, Turkey has always supported initiatives aimed at strengthening the struggle against international terrorism. Turkey has some reservations, however, regarding the advisability of imposing new duties related to that struggle on the United Nations and its agencies and on the establishment of a new unit within the Secretariat, however limited the scope of its duties may be, particularly in view of the serious differences of viewpoint between member States on the definition of terrorism.

III. REPLIES RECEIVED FROM INTERGOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS*

INTERNATIONAL MARITIME ORGANIZATION

[Original: English]

[18 April 1991]

Introduction

1. The General Assembly, by its resolution 40/61 of 9 December 1985, inter alia, called upon IMO "to study the problem of terrorism aboard or against ships with a view to making recommendations on appropriate measures".

2. Previously, IMO had initiated work in order to contribute, in the field of its competence, to the efforts of the international community to prevent unlawful acts against the safety of ships, persons and goods at sea and to preserve the integrity of maritime legislation and trade in general.

3. IMO's initiative in that field goes back to the late 1970s. The growing problem of maritime fraud was first considered by the IMO Assembly in November 1979. At the end of the discussion the Assembly adopted a resolution, on "Barratry and unlawful seizure of ships and their cargoes" (Assembly resolution A.461 (XI)). That resolution alerted Member States to the problem and asked the Council of the Organization to consider possible measures to deal with it. Pursuant to that request of the Assembly, the Council established an Ad Hoc Working Group to examine the matter, in cooperation with the International Chamber of Commerce. On the recommendations of the Working Group the Assembly adopted, in November 1981, resolution A.504(XII) on "Barratry, unlawful seizure of ships and their cargoes and other forms of maritime fraud". By that resolution the IMO Assembly invited Governments to review their laws to ensure that they contained adequate provisions to deal with maritime fraud in all its forms. The Assembly also welcomed, in particular, the establishment by the International Chamber of Shipping of the International Maritime Bureau. The Assembly urged Member Governments to cooperate with the Bureau as might be appropriate.

4. Two years later, in November 1983, the IMO Assembly adopted resolution A.545(13) on "Measures to prevent acts of piracy and armed robbery against ships". On that occasion the proposal for IMO to take action had been submitted by the Government of Sweden. The proposal referred to cases in which ships awaiting for berth many miles offshore had been attacked by persons, who were well-equipped with motorboats and launches. It was pointed out that a distance of 20 miles from the coast no longer gave any protection.

---

* Most of the documents referred to in the replies are available in the Codification Division of the Office of Legal Affairs.

5. The resolution urged Governments concerned to take all measures necessary to prevent and suppress acts of piracy (in the open sea) and armed robbery (elsewhere) against ships and invited Governments and organizations concerned to inform IMO of action taken to implement the aims of the resolution and of any attacks against ships flying their flag. Since then, the Maritime Safety Committee has kept the matter under continuous review. Up to its fifty-ninth session, the Committee has received reports on 239 incidents of piracy and armed robbery against ships.

6. Before the IMO Assembly met in November 1985, the cruise liner Achille Lauro incident occurred in the Mediterranean, in October 1985, and the organization, greatly concerned, adopted urgently resolution A.584(14) on "Measures to prevent unlawful acts which threaten the safety of ships and the security of their passengers and crews".* The Assembly called upon all Governments, port authorities and administrations, shipowners, ship operators, shipmasters and crews to take, as soon as possible, steps to review and, as necessary, strengthen port and on-board security. In addition, it directed the Maritime Safety Committee to develop, on a priority basis, detailed and practical technical measures, including both shoreside and shipboard measures for use by Governments, port authorities and administrations, shipowners, ship operators, shipmasters and crews to ensure the security of passengers and crews on board ships.

7. The Measures, which were eventually adopted by the Maritime Safety Committee in 1986 and disseminated to all IMO's member States as MSC/Circ.443, were based upon a draft prepared by the United States. They outline actions to be taken by port authorities as well as shipowners, shipmasters and crews.

8. The next and, so far, last step in IMO's efforts to bring an end to the unlawful acts at sea by combating their scourge against the travelling public and the peaceful flow of international trade, has been a convention adopted at Rome in March 1988. The proposal for the preparation of a convention to combat unlawful attacks on ships and other acts against their security was submitted to IMO in November 1986 by the Governments of Austria, Egypt and Italy and was considered as an effort to supplement and strengthen the preventive measures developed by the Maritime Safety Committee.

9. The Rome Conference adopted by consensus the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Maritime Navigation and the

---

* One month (December 1985) after the adoption by the IMO Assembly of the above resolution, the United Nations General Assembly adopted resolution 40/61 on "Measures to prevent international terrorism which endangers or takes innocent human lives or jeopardizes fundamental freedoms and study of the underlying causes of those forms of terrorism and acts of violence which lie in misery, frustration, grievance and despair and which cause some people to sacrifice human lives, including their own, in an attempt to affect radical changes".

Protocol for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Fixed Platforms located on the Continental Shelf.

10. The preamble to the Convention states that "unlawful acts against the safety of maritime navigation jeopardize the safety of persons and property, seriously affect the operation of maritime services and undermine the confidence of the peoples of the world in the safety of maritime navigation".

11. The Convention lists the offences covered by the Convention, which include the seizure of ships by force; acts of violence against persons on board ships; and the placing of devices on board a ship which are likely to destroy or damage it.

12. The main purpose of the Convention and of the Protocol is to ensure that appropriate action is taken against any person committing those offences. For that purpose it places on States Parties the obligation either to extradite or to prosecute alleged offenders.

13. Governments which ratify the Convention are obliged to make those offences punishable by appropriate penalties. They are also required to take action when the offences are committed on board a ship flying their flag; in their territorial waters; or by one of their nationals.

14. To date the Convention has been accepted by nine States and the Protocol has been accepted by nine States.

Implementation of the IMO Measures to prevent unlawful acts at sea

Background

15. At its fifty-sixth session, the Maritime Safety Committee of IMO considered that the implementation of the IMO Measures (MSC/Circ.443) by Member Governments needed to be improved and expressed the opinion that this could best be achieved by training programmes and by regional seminars and workshops similar to those already undertaken by the Organization in other fields.

16. The aim of the regional seminars and workshops would be:

(a) To increase awareness of the need to improve maritime security, to explain the Measures and to encourage wider implementation;

(b) To review and suggest practical methods and procedures to be used on ships and at ports for security purposes, including review of the lessons learnt to date; and

(c) Where possible, to consider the advantages of regional security plans and standards similar to those adopted by ICAO.

17. The Committee agreed that such seminars and workshops should be held in regions with intensive passenger ship operations, such as the greater Caribbean, the Mediterranean, the Western Pacific and in other regions, as appropriate.

18. The Committee also invited the Secretary-General to approach the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and potential donor countries with a view to securing the necessary funds to hold such regional seminars and workshops and promoting the relevant training programmes. Member Governments were urged to notify UNDP of the importance of the subject.

19. In response to that invitation, the Organization has so far held three such regional seminars and workshops. The first took place at San Juan, Puerto Rico from 2 to 4 May 1989, for the greater Caribbean region; the second at Athens and on the Aegean Sea from 28 August to 1 September 1989, for the Mediterranean and Black Sea areas; and the third at Tokyo from 5 to 8 March 1991, for the Western Pacific region.

San Juan, Puerto Rico, seminar and workshop (2-4 May 1989)

20. The seminar and workshop was attended by a total of 124 persons, including participants from 19 Caribbean countries, as well as representatives from 5 dependent countries in the greater Caribbean area; 7 observers representing Governments, police and security services, port authorities, shipowners and international organizations from countries outside the greater Caribbean area also attended; ICAO and the International Association of Airport and Seaport Police (IAASP) were also represented.

21. The seminar and workshop was organized by IMO, in cooperation with the United States Government, and with the financial support of the Governments of Canada, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom; the Greek Shipowners' Association for Passenger Ships; and the Norwegian shipping companies Royal Caribbean Cruise Line and Kloster Cruise.

22. During the seminar, 10 lectures were presented by experts, on security measures on cruise passenger ships and port facilities, from Greece, Norway, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom and the United States, ICAO and the IMO secretariat.

23. Subjects included the IMO Measures, shipboard implementation of security measures, facility implementation of security measures, coordination of vessels and facility security measures, methods of assessing facility vulnerabilities to identify the necessary improvements, impact of applying security measures to car and passenger ferries, cooperation in regional search and rescue and marine pollution incidents, policy and practices of ICAO, possible regional security plan for the greater Caribbean and bilateral technical programmes.

24. During the workshop, participants provided information on their national implementation of the IMO Measures and on standards of security in their

national ports and their Governments' intentions in that respect. The workshop adopted six resolutions.

Athens/Aegean Sea seminar and workshop (28 August-1 September 1989)

25. The second IMO regional seminar and workshop was opened at the Eugenides Foundation at Athens and continued on board the passenger ship MTS Pegasus while on cruise in the Aegean Sea from 28 August to 1 September 1989.

26. The seminar and workshop was attended by a total of 56 persons, including participants from 18 Mediterranean and Black Sea countries, as well as 9 observers representing Governments, police and security services, port authorities, shipowners and international organizations. ICAO, the International Chamber of Shipping (ICS) and the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU) were also represented.

27. The seminar and workshop was organized by IMO, in cooperation with the Government of Greece, and with the financial support of the Governments of Canada, France, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom and the United States; the European Economic Community; the Union of Greek Shipowners' Association for Passenger Ships; and the Norwegian shipping companies Royal Caribbean Cruise Line and Kloster Cruise and the Epirotiki Lines of Greece.

28. During the seminar, eight lectures were presented by experts on security measures on cruise passenger ships and port facilities from Greece, France, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom and the United States, ICAO and the IMO secretariat. The lectures covered the same subjects (see para. 23, below) as at the San Juan, Puerto Rico, seminar.

29. During the workshop, participants provided information on their national implementation of the IMO Measures and on standards of security in their national ports and their Governments' intention in this respect.

30. The workshop concurred, in general, with the views expressed at the San Juan seminar and workshop and, endorsing the resolutions adopted at the San Juan seminar and workshop as generally applicable to the Mediterranean and Black Sea areas as well, also adopted six resolutions.

Tokyo seminar and workshop (5-8 March 1991)

31. The third IMO seminar and workshop on prevention of unlawful acts at sea was expanded to include discussion of preventive measures against acts of piracy and armed robbery against ships.

32. The seminar and workshop was attended by a total of 82 persons, including participants from 16 Western Pacific countries, as well as 4 observers representing Governments, police and security services, port authorities, shipowners and international organizations from countries outside the Western Pacific area. The Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), ICAO and the Commission of the European Communities (EEC) were also represented.

33. The seminar and workshop was organized by IMO with financial assistance provided by the Governments of Canada, France, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom; UNDP; EEC; the Ship and Ocean Foundation of Japan; and Veligo Inc. of Italy.

34. During the seminar, 12 lectures were presented by experts on security measures on cruise passenger ships and port facilities and on piracy and armed robbery against ships, from Argentina, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom and the United States, ICAO, UNHCR, and the IMO secretariat.

35. Subjects included the IMO Measures, shipboard implementation of security measures, facility implementation of security measures, coordination of vessels and facility security measures, methods of assessing facility vulnerabilities to identify necessary improvements, policy and practices of ICAO, cooperation among States to prevent and prosecute terrorist acts as part of the new international order, piracy and armed robbery against ships, piracy affecting asylum-seekers and measures to combat crimes at sea, management approach to practical prevention of violence at sea and technical cooperation programmes.

36. During the workshop, participants provided information on their national implementation of the IMO Measures and on standards of security in the national ports and their Governments' intentions for further action in that respect.

37. The seminar and workshop adopted seven resolutions; the texts of resolutions 1 to 5 are similar to those adopted by the 1989 San Juan and Athens/Aegean Sea seminars. In resolution 7 (Prevention and suppression of acts of piracy and armed robbery against ships) IMO member Governments are urged to increase and coordinate their efforts to suppress acts of piracy and armed robbery against ships in their waters and to ensure that prompt action is taken to prosecute any pirates apprehended. In the resolution IMO is invited to seek means of assisting Member States in that regard, through providing advice and organizing regional seminars on the topic for countries where such acts occur frequently.

Resolutions of the three seminars and workshops and other matters

1. Port security committees

38. The San Juan, the Athens/Aegean Sea and the Tokyo seminars and workshops noted that, in many ports, security was the responsibility of several different departments, and the opinion was generally supported that it would be advantageous to establish port security committees comprising representatives of all concerned (i.e. port officials, police and security, customs, immigration, agents, shipowners representatives, and so forth) to ensure a coordinated rather than a fragmented approach to port security. Any exercise to test a security plan should employ all involved in such a port security committee.

2. International Convention on the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Maritime Navigation

39. The San Juan, the Athens/Aegean Sea and the Tokyo seminars and workshops noted that IMO had convened, in Rome in 1988, an international conference which had adopted the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Maritime Navigation and the Protocol for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Fixed Platforms located on the Continental Shelf.

40. The three seminars and workshops, being of the opinion that ratification of the Convention and Protocol and implementation of their provisions by States would do much to deter those intending to commit unlawful acts, adopted resolution 1.

3. Implementation of the IMO Measures

41. The San Juan, the Athens/Aegean Sea and Tokyo seminars and workshops agreed that it was desirable that the widest possible implementation of the IMO Measures throughout the greater Caribbean, the Mediterranean/Black Sea and Western Pacific areas was achieved, considering that would do much to deter those intent on committing unlawful acts. To that effect, the three seminars and workshops adopted resolution 2 urging regional States' port authorities and shipowners to implement the Measures.

4. Technical assistance in security training

42. The San Juan, the Athens/Aegean Sea and the Tokyo seminars and workshops noted that technical assistance in security training would assist many regional countries in their implementation of the IMO Measures. The San Juan seminar and workshop noted, in particular, that training in all aspects of seaport security was available at the Port of Miami, free of charge, for personnel from Caribbean and Latin American ports on request to the Port Director of the Port of Miami.

5. Exercise of port security arrangements

43. The need for training and frequent exercises of all security and port personnel was stressed so as to test and assess port security plans and arrangements and identify any weak points. That should be a continuous process as simple changes affecting the plan, e.g. new telephone numbers, could cause serious problems in real incidents.

6. Exchange of information

44. All three seminars and workshops agreed that it was essential that, when information on a threat of a possible unlawful act against ships became known

to any authority, as appropriate, in the greater Caribbean, Mediterranean and Black Sea areas, or the Western Pacific region, procedures existed to ensure communication of that information to the ports and ships concerned and ensure adequate action was taken to prevent possible unlawful acts occurring. On that basis, the three seminars and workshops adopted resolution 4.

7. Regional security plans

45. There was general support for establishing a regional plan, bearing in mind that experience had shown that a single terrorist incident could affect the whole tourist industry and cause, at least for some time, the multi-billion dollar cruise market to crumble. Preventing such an incident was, therefore, of crucial concern to the three regional States and ship operators. The San Juan, the Athens/Aegean Sea and the Tokyo seminars and workshops adopted resolution 5, providing an outline format for a regional security plan for the prevention of unlawful acts against passengers and crews on board ships.

46. The three seminars and workshops were of the view that regional States should, as soon as possible, begin to cooperate in developing a regional security plan, and the Maritime Safety Committee was invited to examine resolution 5 and instruct the Secretariat to assist and cooperate, as appropriate, with Governments in the greater Caribbean, Mediterranean and Black Sea, and Western Pacific areas in formulating such regional plans.

8. Expressions of appreciation

47. The San Juan, the Athens/Aegean Sea and the Tokyo seminars and workshops adopted a resolution expressing their appreciation to all concerned with hosting, financing, organizing, and running those seminars and workshops.

WORLD TOURISM ORGANIZATION

[Original: English]

[17 April 1991]

In the past, the World Tourism Organization adopted a few resolutions directly addressing international terrorism which naturally adversely affects tourists and the tourism sector. That concern has led to the establishment of a distinct programme entitled "Security and Protection of Tourists and Tourist Facilities", which at present features a number of issues, not all relating to the various components of safety in tourism. Among the projects under way are the "draft recommended measures for tourist protection and security" (previously called "draft rules") which focus on the obligations of States vis-à-vis tourists, particularly international ones, who may suffer from disasters, accidents, legal strifes, fraud and acts of indiscriminate

violence, including terrorism. The preliminary draft of that document which has an orientative value only, is attached in four languages. The recent debate on that document has shown that its terms of reference should be extended to also cover tourism staff, the suppliers of tourism services and the host communities. A point has been made that it should be a non-binding instrument. i.e., that the member States could implement its provisions voluntarily.

WTO follows also the implementation of international instruments conceived by other intergovernmental organizations such as ICAO and IMO, which deal directly with international terrorism and have a bearing on the safety of air and sea passengers who in most cases appear also to be tourists. Representatives of those organizations assist in WTO activities aimed at the implementation of the WTO tourist protection and security programme.

INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY

[Original: English]

[18 April 1990]

The Convention on Physical Protection of Nuclear Material, which entered into force on 8 February 1987, has 47 signatories and 28 parties. In September 1989, the Agency's General Conference adopted resolution GC (XXXIII)/RES/510 which, among other things, requested the Director General to provide assistance so that a meeting of experts could be held in 1990 to prepare recommendations to facilitate cooperation in implementing the Convention. Such a meeting has been scheduled to take place during June 1990. During 1989, the recommendations in Agency document INFCIRC/225/Rev.1 on the physical protection of nuclear material were revised by an expert committee. The changes reflect mainly: the international consensus established in respect of the Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material; the experience gained since the last review of the recommendations in 1977; and the need to clarify several issues, including that of sabotage of nuclear facilities. The revised recommendations have been issued as Agency document INFCIRC/225/Rev.2.

Notes

1/ Legal Consequences for States of the Continued Presence of South Africa in Namibia (South West Africa) notwithstanding Security Council Resolution 276 (1970), Advisory Opinion, I.C.J. Reports 1971, p. 16.

2/ Report of the International Narcotics Control Board for 1990, United Nations publication, Sales No. E.90.XI, para. 3.

3/ Ibid., para. 4.

ANNEX

State, as at 16 July 1991, of signatures of, and ratifications of or accessions to, international conventions relating to various aspects of the problem of international terrorism

A. Conventions in respect of which the Secretary-General of the United Nations performs depository functions a/

1. Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 14 December 1973 (entered into force on 20 February 1977, in accordance with article 17 (a))

Participant	Signature	Ratification, accession
Argentina		18 March 1982
Australia	30 December 1974	20 June 1977
Austria		3 August 1977
Bahamas		22 July 1986
Barbados		26 October 1979
Bhutan		16 January 1989
Bulgaria	27 June 1974	18 July 1974
Burundi		17 December 1980
Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic	11 June 1974	5 February 1976
Canada	26 June 1974	4 August 1976
Chile		21 January 1977
China		5 August 1987
Costa Rica		2 November 1977
Cyprus		24 December 1975
Czechoslovakia	11 October 1974	30 June 1975
Denmark	10 May 1974	1 July 1975
Democratic People's Republic of Korea		1 December 1982
Dominican Republic		8 July 1977
Ecuador	27 August 1974	12 March 1975
Egypt		25 June 1986
El Salvador		8 August 1980
Finland	10 May 1974	31 October 1978

a/ For the text of reservations, declarations or communications accompanying the signatures, ratifications or accessions to the two conventions below, see Multilateral Treaties Deposited with the Secretary-General, document ST/LEG/SER.E/9 (Sales No. E.91.V.8 as well as its subsequent issues).

Participant	Signature	Ratification, accession
Gabon		14 October 1981
Germany	15 August 1974	25 January 1977
Ghana		25 April 1975
Greece		3 July 1984
Guatemala	12 December 1974	18 January 1983
Haiti		25 August 1980
Hungary	6 November 1974	26 March 1975
Iceland	10 May 1974	2 August 1977
India		11 April 1978
Iran (Islamic Republic of)		12 July 1978
Iraq		28 February 1978
Israel		31 July 1980
Italy	30 December 1974	30 August 1985
Jamaica		21 September 1978
Japan		8 June 1987
Jordan		18 December 1984
Kuwait		1 March 1989
Liberia		30 September 1975
Malawi		14 March 1977
Maldives		21 August 1990
Mexico		22 April 1980
Mongolia	23 August 1974	8 August 1975
Nepal		9 March 1990
Netherlands		6 December 1988
New Zealand		12 November 1985
Nicaragua	29 October 1974	10 March 1975
Niger		17 June 1985
Norway	10 May 1974	28 April 1980
Oman		22 March 1988
Pakistan		29 March 1976
Panama		17 June 1980
Paraguay	25 October 1974	24 November 1975
Peru		25 April 1978
Philippines		26 November 1976
Poland	7 June 1974	14 December 1982
Republic of Korea		25 May 1983
Romania	27 December 1974	15 August 1978
Rwanda	15 October 1974	29 November 1977
Seychelles		29 May 1980
Spain		8 August 1985
Sri Lanka		27 February 1991
Sweden	10 May 1974	1 July 1975
Switzerland		5 March 1985
Syrian Arab Republic		25 April 1988
Togo		30 December 1980
Trinidad and Tobago		15 June 1979
Tunisia	15 May 1974	21 January 1977

Participant	Signature	Ratification, accession
Turkey		11 June 1981
Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic	18 June 1974	20 January 1976
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	7 June 1974	15 January 1976
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	13 December 1974	2 May 1979
United States of America	28 December 1973	26 October 1976
Uruguay		13 June 1978
Yemen		9 February 1987
Yugoslavia	17 December 1974	29 December 1976
Zaire		25 July 1977

2. International Convention against the Taking of Hostages, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 17 December 1979 (entered into force on 3 June 1983, in accordance with article 18 (i))

Participant	Signature	Ratification, accession
Antigua and Barbuda		6 August 1986
Australia		21 May 1990
Austria	3 October 1980	22 August 1986
Bahamas		4 June 1981
Barbados		9 March 1981
Belgium	3 January 1980	
Bhutan		31 August 1981
Bolivia	25 March 1980	
Brunei Darussalam		18 October 1988
Bulgaria		10 March 1988
Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic		1 July 1987
Cameroon		9 March 1988
Canada	18 February 1980	4 December 1985
Chile	3 January 1980	12 November 1981
Côte d'Ivoire		22 August 1989
Czechoslovakia		27 January 1988
Denmark		11 August 1987
Dominica		9 September 1986
Dominican Republic	12 August 1980	
Ecuador		2 May 1988
Egypt	18 December 1980	2 October 1981
El Salvador	10 June 1980	12 February 1981
Finland	29 October 1980	14 April 1983
Gabon	29 February 1980	
Germany	18 December 1979	15 December 1980
Ghana		10 November 1987
Greece	18 March 1980	18 June 1981
Grenada		10 December 1990
Guatemala	30 April 1980	11 March 1983
Haiti	21 April 1980	
Honduras	11 June 1980	1 June 1981
Hungary		2 September 1987
Iceland		6 July 1981
Iraq	14 October 1980	
Israel	19 November 1980	
Italy	18 April 1980	20 March 1986
Jamaica	27 February 1980	
Japan	22 December 1980	8 June 1987
Jordan		19 February 1986
Kenya		8 December 1981
Kuwait		6 February 1989

Participant	Signature	Ratification, accession
Lesotho	17 April 1980	5 November 1980
Liberia	30 January 1980	
Luxembourg	18 December 1979	29 April 1991
Malawi		17 March 1986
Mali		8 February 1990
Mauritius	18 June 1980	17 October 1980
Mexico		28 April 1987
Nepal		9 March 1990
Netherlands	18 December 1980	
New Zealand	24 December 1980	12 November 1985
Norway	18 December 1980	2 July 1981
Oman		22 July 1988
Panama	24 January 1980	19 August 1982
Philippines	2 May 1980	14 October 1980
Portugal	16 June 1980	6 July 1984
Republic of Korea		4 May 1983
Romania		17 May 1990
Saint Kitts and Nevis		17 January 1991
Saudi Arabia		8 January 1991
Senegal	2 June 1980	10 March 1987
Spain		26 March 1984
Sudan		19 June 1990
Suriname	30 July 1980	5 November 1981
Sweden	25 February 1980	15 January 1981
Switzerland	18 July 1980	5 March 1985
Trinidad and Tobago		1 April 1981
Togo	8 July 1980	25 July 1986
Turkey		15 August 1989
Uganda	10 November 1980	
Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic		19 June 1987
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics		11 June 1987
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	18 December 1979	22 December 1982
United States of America	21 December 1979	7 December 1984
Venezuela		13 December 1988
Yugoslavia	29 December 1980	19 April 1985
Zaire	2 July 1980	

B. Conventions in respect of which the International Civil Aviation Organization, the International Maritime Organization, the International Atomic Energy Agency, or some Member States perform depository functions

1. Convention on Offences and Certain Other Acts Committed on Board Aircraft, signed at Tokyo on 14 September 1963 (entered into force on 4 December 1969, in accordance with article 21, paragraph (1)) a/

States	Date of signature	Date of deposit of instrument of ratification or accession	Effective date
Afghanistan		15 April 1977	14 July 1977
Antigua and Barbuda		19 July 1985	17 October 1985
Argentina		23 July 1971	21 October 1971
Australia		22 June 1970	20 September 1970
Austria		7 February 1974	8 May 1974
Bahamas			10 July 1973 (1)
Bahrain		9 February 1984	9 May 1984 (2) (3)
Bangladesh		25 July 1978	23 October 1978
Barbados	25 June 1969	4 April 1972	3 July 1972
Belgium	20 December 1968	6 August 1970	4 November 1970
Bhutan		25 January 1989	25 April 1989
Bolivia		5 July 1979	3 October 1979
Botswana		16 January 1979	16 April 1979
Brazil	28 February 1969	14 January 1970	14 April 1970
Brunei Darussalam		23 May 1986	21 August 1986
Bulgaria		28 September 1989	27 December 1989 (4)
Burkina Faso	14 September 1963	6 June 1969	4 December 1969
Burundi		14 July 1971	12 October 1971
Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic		3 February 1988	3 May 1988 (2) (5)
Cameroon		24 March 1988	22 June 1988
Canada	4 November 1964	7 November 1969	5 February 1970
Cape Verde		4 October 1989	2 January 1990
Central African Republic		11 June 1991	9 September 1991

a/ The information concerning this convention is reproduced below as furnished on 16 July 1991 by the secretariat of the International Civil Aviation Organization.

States	Date of signature	Date of deposit of instrument of ratification or accession	Effective date
Chad		30 June 1970	28 September 1970
Chile		24 January 1974	24 April 1974
China		14 November 1978	12 February 1979 (2) (6)
Colombia	8 November 1968	6 July 1973	4 October 1973
Comoros		23 May 1991	21 August 1991
Congo	14 September 1963	13 November 1978	11 February 1979
Costa Rica		24 October 1972	22 January 1973
Côte d'Ivoire		3 June 1970	1 September 1970
Cyprus		31 May 1972	29 August 1972
Czechoslovakia		23 February 1984	23 May 1984 (7)
Democratic People's Republic of Korea		9 May 1983	7 August 1983 (2)
Denmark	21 November 1966	17 January 1967	4 December 1969
Dominican Republic		3 December 1970	3 March 1971
Ecuador	8 July 1969	3 December 1969	3 March 1970
Egypt		12 February 1975	13 May 1975 (2)
El Salvador		13 February 1980	13 May 1980
Equatorial Guinea		27 February 1991	28 May 1991
Ethiopia		27 March 1979	25 June 1979 (2)
Fiji			10 October 1970 (8)
Finland	24 October 1969	2 April 1971	1 July 1971
France	11 July 1969	11 September 1970	10 December 1970
Gabon		14 January 1970	14 April 1970
Gambia		4 January 1979	4 April 1979
Germany	14 September 1963	16 December 1969	16 March 1970 (9)
Ghana		2 January 1974	2 April 1974
Greece	21 October 1969	31 May 1971	29 August 1971
Grenada		28 August 1978	26 November 1978
Guatemala	14 September 1963	17 November 1970	15 February 1971 (2)
Guyana		20 December 1972	19 March 1973
Haiti		26 April 1984	25 July 1984
Holy See	14 September 1963		
Honduras		8 April 1987	7 July 1987 (2)
Hungary		3 December 1970	3 March 1971 (10)
Iceland		16 March 1970	14 June 1970
India		22 July 1975	20 October 1975 (2)
Indonesia	14 September 1963	7 September 1976	6 December 1976 (2)
Iran (Islamic Republic of)		28 June 1976	29 September 1976
Iraq		15 May 1974	13 August 1974 (11)
Ireland	20 October 1964	14 November 1975	12 February 1976

States	Date of signature	Date of deposit of instrument of ratification or accession	Effective date
Israel	1 November 1968	19 September 1969	18 December 1969
Italy	14 September 1963	18 October 1968	4 December 1969
Jamaica		16 September 1983	15 December 1983
Japan	14 September 1963	26 May 1970	24 August 1970
Jordan		3 May 1973	1 August 1973
Kenya		22 June 1970	20 September 1970
Kuwait		27 November 1979	25 February 1980 (12)
Lao People's Democratic Republic		23 October 1972	21 January 1973
Lebanon		11 June 1974	9 September 1974
Lesotho		28 April 1972	27 July 1972
Liberia	14 September 1963		
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		21 June 1972	19 September 1972
Luxembourg		21 September 1972	20 December 1972
Madagascar	2 December 1969	2 December 1969	2 March 1970
Malawi		28 December 1972	28 March 1973
Malaysia		5 March 1985	3 June 1985
Maldives		28 September 1987	27 December 1987
Mali		31 May 1971	29 August 1971
Malta		28 June 1991	26 September 1991
Marshall Islands		15 May 1989	13 August 1989
Mauritania		30 June 1977	28 September 1977
Mauritius		5 April 1983	4 July 1983
Mexico	24 December 1968	18 March 1969	4 December 1969
Monaco		2 June 1983	31 August 1983
Mongolia		24 July 1990	22 October 1990
Morocco		21 October 1975	19 January 1976 (13)
Nauru		17 May 1984	15 August 1984
Nepal		15 January 1979	15 April 1979
Netherlands	9 June 1967	14 November 1969	12 February 1970 (14)
New Zealand		12 February 1974	13 May 1974
Nicaragua		24 August 1973	22 November 1973
Niger	14 April 1969	27 June 1969	4 December 1969
Nigeria	29 June 1965	7 April 1970	6 July 1970
Norway	19 April 1966	17 January 1967	4 December 1969
Oman		9 February 1977	10 May 1977 (2) (15)
Pakistan	6 August 1965	11 September 1973	10 December 1973
Panama	14 September 1963	16 November 1970	14 February 1971
Papua New Guinea			16 September 1975 (2) (16)
Paraguay		9 August 1971	7 November 1971
Peru		12 May 1978	10 August 1978 (2)

States	Date of signature	Date of deposit of instrument of ratification or accession	Effective date
Philippines	14 September 1963	26 November 1965	4 December 1969
Poland		19 March 1971	17 June 1971 (2)
Portugal	11 March 1964	25 November 1964	4 December 1969
Qatar		6 August 1981	5 December 1981
Republic of Korea	8 December 1965	19 February 1971	20 May 1971
Romania		15 February 1974	16 May 1974 (2)
Rwanda		17 May 1971	15 August 1971
Saint Lucia		31 October 1983	29 January 1984
Saudi Arabia	6 April 1967	21 November 1969	19 February 1970
Senegal	20 February 1964	9 March 1972	7 June 1972
Seychelles		4 January 1979	4 April 1979
Sierra Leone		9 November 1970	7 February 1971
Singapore		1 March 1971	30 May 1971
Solomon Islands		23 March 1982	7 July 1978 (17)
South Africa		26 May 1972	24 August 1972 (2)
Spain	27 July 1964	1 October 1969	30 December 1969
Sri Lanka		30 May 1978	28 August 1978
Suriname		10 September 1979	25 November 1975 (18)
Sweden	14 September 1963	17 January 1967	4 December 1969
Switzerland	31 October 1969	21 December 1970	21 March 1971
Syrian Arab Republic		31 July 1980	29 October 1980 (2)
Thailand		6 March 1972	4 June 1972
Togo		26 July 1971	24 October 1971
Trinidad and Tobago		9 February 1972	9 May 1972
Tunisia		25 February 1975	26 May 1975 (2)
Turkey		17 December 1975	16 March 1976
Uganda		25 June 1982	23 September 1982
Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic		29 February 1988	29 May 1988 (2) (19)
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics		3 February 1988	3 May 1988 (2) (20)
United Arab Emirates		16 April 1981	15 July 1981 (21)
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	14 September 1963	29 November 1968	4 December 1969 (22)

/...

States	Date of signature	Date of deposit of instrument of ratification or accession	Effective date
United Republic of Tanzania		12 August 1983	10 November 1983
United States of America	14 September 1963	5 September 1969	4 December 1969
Uruguay		26 January 1977	26 April 1977
Vanuatu		31 January 1989	1 May 1989
Venezuela	13 March 1964	4 February 1983	5 May 1983 (2)
Viet Nam		10 October 1979	8 January 1980 (2)
Yemen		26 September 1986	25 December 1986
Yugoslavia	14 September 1963	12 February 1971	13 May 1971
Zaire		20 July 1977	18 October 1977
Zambia		14 September 1971	13 December 1971
Zimbabwe		8 March 1989	6 June 1989

---

(1) Declaration dated 15 May 1975 by Bahamas that it considers itself to be bound to the said Convention by virtue of the ratification of the United Kingdom and pursuant to customary international law. The Commonwealth of the Bahamas attained independence on 10 July 1973.

(2) Reservation: Does not consider itself bound by Article 24, paragraph 1, of the Convention.

(3) Reservation: "The accession of the State of Bahrain to the Convention shall not be considered or interpreted as recognition of 'Israel' either generally or implicitly under the Convention."

(4) Declaration dated 21 August 1989 by the People's Republic of Bulgaria that "the accession of the People's Republic of Bulgaria to the Convention on Offences and Certain Other Acts Committed on Board Aircraft does not affect its rights and obligations under the multilateral and bilateral agreements on acts of unlawful interference against civil aviation, to which it is a Party".

(5) Declaration dated 17 December 1987 by the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic that "the accession of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic to the Convention on Offences and Certain Other Acts Committed on Board Aircraft does not affect its rights and obligations under agreements in force on the suppression of acts of unlawful interference with civil aviation, to which it is a Party".

(6) The Instrument of Accession contains the following statement: "The Chinese Government declares illegal and null and void the signature and ratification by the Chiang clique usurping the name of China in regard to the above-mentioned Convention".

(7) On 3 May 1991, a Declaration dated 28 March 1991 was deposited with the International Civil Aviation Organization by the Government of Czechoslovakia whereby that Government withdraws the reservation made at the time of accession on 23 February 1984 with regard to Article 24, paragraph 1, of the Convention. The Declaration took effect on 3 May 1991.

(8) Declaration dated 18 January 1972 by Fiji that it succeeded, upon independence, (whereof the date was 10 October 1970) to the rights and obligations of the United Kingdom in respect of this Convention.

(9) The German Democratic Republic, which acceded to the Convention on 10 January 1989, acceded to the Federal Republic of Germany on 3 October 1990.

(10) On 12 December 1989, a Declaration dated 16 October 1989 was deposited with the International Civil Aviation Organization by the Government of Hungary whereby that Government withdraws the reservation made at the time of accession on 3 December 1970 with regard to Article 24, paragraph 1, of the Convention. The Declaration took effect on 12 December 1989.

(11) Accession by the Republic of Iraq to the Convention shall, however, in no way signify recognition of Israel or entry into any relations with it.

(12) It is understood that the accession to the Convention on Offences and Certain Other Acts Committed on Board Aircraft, done at Tokyo, 1963, does not mean in any way recognition of Israel by the State of Kuwait. Furthermore, no treaty relation will arise between the State of Kuwait and Israel.

(13) "In case of a dispute, all recourse must be made to the International Court of Justice on the basis of the unanimous consent of the parties concerned."

(14) Declaration: "... the Convention, with respect to the Kingdom of the Netherlands, shall not enter into force for Suriname and/or the Netherlands Antilles until the ninetieth day after the date on which the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands will have notified the International Civil Aviation Organization that in Suriname and/or in the Netherlands Antilles the necessary steps for giving effect to the provisions of the above-mentioned Convention have been taken".

Note 1: On 4 June 1974, a Declaration dated 10 May 1974 was deposited with the International Civil Aviation Organization by the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands stating that the necessary steps for giving effect to the provisions of the Convention have been taken in regard to making the Convention applicable to Suriname and the Netherlands Antilles. Accordingly, the Convention takes effect for Suriname and the Netherlands Antilles on 2 September 1974. (See also footnote 18.)

Note 2: By a Note dated 30 December 1985, the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands informed the International Civil Aviation Organization that, as of 1 January 1986, the Convention was applicable to the Netherlands Antilles (without Aruba) and to Aruba.

(15) The accession by the Government of the Sultanate of Oman to the Convention does not mean or imply, and shall not be interpreted as, recognition of Israel generally or in the context of this Convention.

(16) Declaration dated 6 November 1975 by Papua New Guinea that "it desires to be treated as a party in its own right to the said Convention", which entered into force for Australia on 20 September 1970, and had applied to the Territory of Papua and Trust Territory of New Guinea. Papua New Guinea attained independence on 16 September 1975.

(17) The Solomon Islands attained independence on 7 July 1978; the Instrument of Succession was deposited on 23 March 1982.

(18) The Instrument of Succession was deposited with the International Civil Aviation Organization on 10 September 1979. Prior to that date, the provisions of the Convention applied to Suriname by virtue of a declaration dated 10 May 1974 by the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands. The Republic of Suriname attained independence on 25 November 1975. (See also footnote 14.)

(19) Declaration dated 13 January 1988 by the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic that "the accession of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic to the Convention on Offences and Certain Other Acts Committed on Board Aircraft does not affect its rights and obligations under bilateral and multilateral agreements in force on the suppression of acts of unlawful interference with civil aviation, to which it is a Party".

(20) Declaration dated 4 December 1987 by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics that "the accession of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to the Convention on Offences and Certain Other Acts Committed on Board Aircraft does not affect its rights and obligations under bilateral and multilateral agreements in force on the suppression of acts of unlawful interference with civil aviation, to which it is a Party".

(21) Reservation: "In accepting the said Convention, the Government of the United Arab Emirates takes the view that its acceptance of the said Convention does not in any way imply its recognition of Israel, nor does it oblige to apply the provisions of the Convention in respect of the said Country."

(22) Declaration: "... the provisions of the Convention shall not apply in regard to Southern Rhodesia unless and until the Government of the United Kingdom informs the International Civil Aviation Organization that they are in a position to ensure that the obligations imposed by the Convention in respect of that territory can be fully implemented".

Note: On 1 December 1982, a Declaration dated 12 November 1982 was deposited with the International Civil Aviation Organization stating that the provisions of the Convention shall extend to Anguilla. Accordingly, the Convention takes effect for Anguilla on 1 December 1982.

2. Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Seizure of Aircraft, signed at The Hague on 16 December 1970 (entered into force on 14 October 1971) a/

States	Date of signature	Date of deposit of instrument of ratification or accession
Afghanistan	16 December 1970	29 August 1979
Antigua and Barbuda		22 July 1985
Argentina	16 December 1970	11 September 1972 (1)
Australia	15 June 1971	9 November 1972
Austria	28 April 1971	11 February 1974
Bahamas		13 August 1976
Bahrain		20 February 1984 (2)
Bangladesh		28 June 1978
Barbados	16 December 1970	2 April 1973
Belgium	16 December 1970	24 August 1973
Benin	5 May 1971	13 March 1972
Bhutan		28 December 1988
Bolivia		18 July 1979
Botswana		28 December 1978
Brazil	16 December 1970	14 January 1972 (2)
Brunei Darussalam		16 April 1986
Bulgaria	16 December 1970	19 May 1971 (2)
Burkina Faso		19 October 1987
Burundi	17 February 1971	
Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic	16 December 1970	30 December 1971 (2)
Cameroon		14 April 1988
Canada	16 December 1970	20 June 1972
Cape Verde		20 October 1977
Central African Republic		1 July 1991
Chad	27 September 1971	12 July 1972
Chile	4 June 1971	2 February 1972
China		10 September 1980 (2) (3)
Colombia	16 December 1970	3 July 1973
Costa Rica	16 December 1970	9 July 1971
Côte d'Ivoire		9 January 1973
Cyprus		5 July 1972
Czechoslovakia	16 December 1970	6 April 1972 (4)
Democratic Kampuchea	16 December 1970	
Democratic People's Republic of Korea		28 April 1983

a/ The information concerning this Convention is reproduced below as furnished on 16 July 1991 by the secretariat of the International Civil Aviation Organization.

States	Date of signature	Date of deposit of instrument of ratification or accession
Denmark	16 December 1970	17 October 1972 (5)
Dominican Republic	29 June 1971	22 June 1978
Ecuador	19 March 1971	14 June 1971
Egypt		28 February 1975 (2)
El Salvador	16 December 1970	16 January 1973
Equatorial Guinea	4 June 1971	2 January 1991
Ethiopia	16 December 1970	26 March 1979
Fiji	5 October 1971	27 July 1972
Finland	8 January 1971	15 December 1971
France	16 December 1970	18 September 1972
Gabon	16 December 1970	14 July 1971
Gambia	18 May 1971	28 November 1978
Germany	16 December 1970	11 October 1974 (6)
Ghana	16 December 1970	12 December 1973
Greece	16 December 1970	20 September 1973
Grenada		10 August 1978
Guatemala	16 December 1970	16 May 1979 (2)
Guinea		2 May 1984
Guinea-Bissau		20 August 1976
Guyana		21 December 1972
Haiti		9 May 1984
Honduras		13 April 1987
Hungary	16 December 1970	13 August 1971 (7)
Iceland		29 June 1973
India	14 July 1971	12 November 1982 (2)
Indonesia	16 December 1970	27 August 1976 (2)
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	16 December 1970	25 January 1972
Iraq	22 February 1971	3 December 1971
Ireland		24 November 1975
Israel	16 December 1970	16 August 1971
Italy	16 December 1970	19 February 1974
Jamaica	16 December 1970	15 September 1983
Japan	16 December 1970	19 April 1971
Jordan	9 June 1971	18 November 1971
Kenya		11 January 1977
Kuwait	21 July 1971	25 May 1979 (8)
Lao People's Democratic Republic	16 February 1971	6 April 1989
Lebanon		10 August 1973
Lesotho		27 July 1978
Liberia		1 February 1982
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		4 October 1978 (9)
Liechtenstein	24 August 1971	
Luxembourg	16 December 1970	22 November 1978
Madagascar		18 November 1986

States	Date of signature	Date of deposit of instrument of ratification or accession
Malawi		21 December 1972 (2)
Malaysia	16 December 1970	4 May 1985
Maldives		1 September 1987
Mali		29 September 1971
Marshall Islands		31 May 1989
Mauritania		1 November 1978
Mauritius		25 April 1983
Mexico	16 December 1970	19 July 1972
Monaco		3 June 1983
Mongolia	18 January 1971	8 October 1971
Morocco		24 October 1975 (10)
Nauru		17 May 1984
Nepal		11 January 1979
Netherlands	16 December 1970	27 August 1973 (11)
New Zealand	15 September 1971	12 February 1974
Nicaragua		6 November 1973
Niger	19 February 1971	15 October 1971
Nigeria		3 July 1973
Norway	9 March 1971	23 August 1971
Oman		2 February 1977 (2) (12)
Pakistan	12 August 1971	28 November 1973
Panama	16 December 1970	10 March 1972
Papua New Guinea		15 December 1975 (2)
Paraguay	30 July 1971	4 February 1972
Peru		28 April 1978 (2)
Philippines	16 December 1970	26 March 1973
Poland	16 December 1970	21 March 1972 (2)
Portugal	16 December 1970	27 November 1972
Qatar		26 August 1981 (2)
Republic of Korea		18 January 1973 (13)
Romania	13 October 1971	10 July 1972 (2)
Rwanda	16 December 1970	3 November 1987
Saint Lucia		8 November 1983
Saudi Arabia		14 June 1974 (2) (14)
Senegal	10 May 1971	3 February 1978
Seychelles		29 December 1978
Sierra Leone	19 July 1971	13 November 1974
Singapore	8 September 1971	12 April 1978
South Africa	16 December 1970	30 May 1972 (2)
Spain	16 March 1971	30 October 1972
Sri Lanka		30 May 1978
Sudan		18 January 1979
Suriname		25 November 1975 (15)
Sweden	16 December 1970	7 July 1971
Switzerland	16 December 1970	14 September 1971

States	Date of signature	Date of deposit of instrument of ratification or accession
Syrian Arab Republic		10 July 1980 (2)
Thailand	16 December 1970	16 May 1978
Togo		9 February 1979
Tonga		21 February 1977
Trinidad and Tobago	16 December 1970	31 January 1972
Tunisia		16 November 1981 (2)
Turkey	16 December 1970	17 April 1973
Uganda		27 March 1972
Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic	16 December 1970	21 February 1972 (2)
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	16 December 1970	24 September 1971 (2)
United Arab Emirates		10 April 1981 (16)
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	16 December 1970	22 December 1971 (17)
United Republic of Tanzania		9 August 1983
United States of America	16 December 1970	14 September 1971
Uruguay		12 January 1977
Vanuatu		22 February 1989
Venezuela	16 December 1970	7 July 1983
Viet Nam		17 September 1979 (2)
Yemen		29 September 1986
Yugoslavia	16 December 1970	2 October 1972
Zaire		6 July 1977
Zambia		3 March 1987
Zimbabwe		6 February 1989

---

(1) The instrument of ratification by Argentina contains a declaration which, in translation, reads: "The application of this Convention to territories the sovereignty of which may be disputed among two or more States, whether parties to the Convention or not, may not be interpreted as alteration, renunciation or waiver of the position upheld by each up to the present time".

(2) Reservation made with respect to paragraph 1 of article 12 of the Convention.

(3) The instrument of accession by the Government of the People's Republic of China contains the following declaration: "The Chinese Government declares illegal and null and void the signature and ratification of the above-mentioned Convention by the Taiwan authorities in the name of China".

(4) On 25 April 1991, an instrument was deposited with the Government of the United States by the Government of Czechoslovakia whereby that Government withdraws the reservation made at the time of ratification on 6 April 1972 with regard to paragraph 1 of Article 12 of the Convention. The withdrawal of the reservation took effect on 25 April 1991.

(5) Until a later decision, the Convention will not be applied to the Faroe Islands or to Greenland.

Note: A notification was received by the Government of the United Kingdom from the Government of the Kingdom of Denmark that, with effect from 1 June 1980, Denmark withdraws its reservation, made in the following terms upon ratification, in respect of Greenland:

"Sous la réserve que jusqu'à décision ultérieure la Convention ne s'appliquera pas aux Iles Féroé et au Groënland."

(6) The German Democratic Republic, which ratified the Convention on 3 June 1971, acceded to the Federal Republic of Germany on 3 October 1990.

(7) On 10 January 1990, instruments were deposited with the Government of the United Kingdom and the Government of the United States by the Government of Hungary whereby that Government withdraws the reservation made at the time of ratification on 13 August 1971 with regard to paragraph 1 of Article 12 of the Convention. The withdrawal of the reservation took effect on 10 January 1990.

(8) Ratification by Kuwait was accompanied by an Understanding stating that ratification of the Convention does not mean in any way recognition of Israel by the State of Kuwait. Furthermore, no treaty relations will arise between the State of Kuwait and Israel.

(9) The instrument of accession deposited by the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya contains a disclaimer regarding recognition of Israel.

(10) "In case of a dispute, all recourse must be made to the International Court of Justice on the basis of the unanimous consent of the parties concerned."

(11) The Convention cannot enter into force for the Netherlands Antilles until thirty days after the date on which the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands shall have notified the depositary Governments that the necessary measures to give effect to the provisions of the Convention have been taken in the Netherlands Antilles.

Note 1: On 11 June 1974, a declaration was deposited with the Government of the United States by the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands stating that in the interim the measures required to implement the provisions of the Convention have been taken in the Netherlands Antilles and, consequently, the Convention will enter into force for the Netherlands Antilles on the thirtieth day after the date of deposit of this declaration.

Note 2: By a Note dated 9 January 1986 the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands informed the Government of the United States that as of 1 January 1986 the Convention is applicable to the Netherlands Antilles (without Aruba) and to Aruba.

(12) Accession of the said Convention by the Government of the Sultanate of Oman does not mean or imply, and shall not be interpreted as recognition of Israel generally or in the context of this Convention.

(13) The accession by the Government of the Republic of Korea to the present Convention does not, an any way, mean or imply the recognition of any territory or régime which has not been recognized by the Government of the Republic of Korea as a State or Government.

(14) Approval by Saudi Arabia does not mean and could not be interpreted as recognition of Israel generally or in the context of this Convention.

(15) Notification of succession to the Convention was deposited with the Government of the United States on 27 October 1978, by virtue of the extension of the Convention to Suriname by the Kingdom of the Netherlands prior to independence. The Republic of Suriname attained independence on 25 November 1975.

(16) "In accepting the said Convention, the Government of the United Arab Emirates takes the view that its acceptance of the said Convention does not in any way imply its recognition of Israel, nor does it oblige to apply the provisions of the Convention in respect of the said Country."

(17) The Convention is ratified "in respect of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Territories under territorial sovereignty of the United Kingdom as well as the British Solomon Islands Protectorate".

3. Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Civil Aviation, signed at Montreal on 23 September 1971 (entered into force on 26 January 1973) a/

States	Date of signature	Date of deposit of instrument of ratification or accession
Afghanistan		26 September 1984 (1)
Antigua and Barbuda		22 July 1985
Argentina	23 September 1971	26 November 1973
Australia	12 October 1972	12 July 1973
Austria	13 November 1972	11 February 1974
Bahamas		27 December 1984
Bahrain		20 February 1984 (1)
Bangladesh		28 June 1978
Barbados	23 September 1971	6 August 1976
Belgium	23 September 1971	13 August 1976
Bhutan		28 December 1988
Bolivia		18 July 1979
Botswana	12 October 1972	28 December 1978
Brazil	23 September 1971	24 July 1972 (1)
Brunei Darussalam		16 April 1986
Bulgaria	23 September 1971	28 March 1973 (1)
Burkina Faso		19 October 1987
Burundi	6 March 1972	
Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic	23 September 1971	31 January 1973 (1)
Cameroon		11 July 1973 (2)
Canada	23 September 1971	19 June 1972
Cape Verde		20 October 1977
Central African Republic		1 July 1991
Chad	23 September 1971	12 July 1972
Chile		28 February 1974
China		10 September 1980 (1) (3)
Colombia		4 December 1974
Congo	23 September 1971	19 March 1987
Costa Rica	23 September 1971	21 September 1973
Côte d'Ivoire		9 January 1973
Cyprus	28 November 1972	15 August 1973
Czechoslovakia	23 September 1971	10 August 1973 (4)
Democratic People's Republic of Korea		13 August 1980

---

a/ The information concerning this Convention is reproduced below as furnished on 16 July 1991 by the secretariat of the International Civil Aviation Organization.

States	Date of signature	Date of deposit of instrument of ratification or accession
Denmark	17 October 1972	17 January 1973 (5)
Dominican Republic	31 May 1972	28 November 1973
Ecuador		12 January 1977
Egypt	24 November 1972	20 May 1975 (1)
El Salvador		25 September 1979
Equatorial Guinea		2 January 1991
Ethiopia	23 September 1971	26 March 1979 (1)
Fiji	21 August 1972	5 March 1973
Finland		13 July 1973
France		30 June 1976 (1)
Gabon	24 November 1971	29 June 1976
Gambia		28 November 1978
Germany	23 September 1971	3 February 1978 (6)
Ghana		12 December 1973
Greece	9 February 1972	15 January 1974
Grenada		10 August 1978
Guatemala	9 May 1972	19 October 1978 (1)
Guinea		2 May 1984
Guinea-Bissau		20 August 1976
Guyana		21 December 1972
Haiti	6 January 1972	9 May 1984
Honduras		13 April 1987
Hungary	23 September 1971	27 December 1972 (7)
Iceland		29 June 1973
India	11 December 1972	12 November 1982
Indonesia		27 August 1976 (1)
Iran (Islamic Republic of)		10 July 1973
Iraq		10 September 1974
Ireland		12 October 1976
Israel	23 September 1971	30 June 1972
Italy	23 September 1971	19 February 1974
Jamaica	23 September 1971	15 September 1983
Japan		12 June 1974
Jordan	2 May 1972	13 February 1973
Kenya		11 January 1977
Kuwait		23 November 1979 (8)
Lao People's Democratic Republic	1 November 1972	6 April 1989
Lebanon		23 December 1977
Lesotho		27 July 1978
Liberia		1 February 1982
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		19 February 1974
Luxembourg	29 November 1971	18 May 1982
Madagascar		18 November 1986
Malawi		21 December 1972 (1)
Malaysia		4 May 1985

States	Date of signature	Date of deposit of instrument of ratification or accession
Maldives		1 September 1987
Mali		24 August 1972
Marshall Islands		31 May 1989
Mauritania		1 November 1978
Mauritius		25 April 1983
Mexico	25 January 1973	12 September 1974
Monaco		3 June 1983
Mongolia	18 February 1972	14 September 1972 (1)
Morocco		24 October 1975 (9)
Nauru		17 May 1984
Nepal		11 January 1979
Netherlands	23 September 1971	27 August 1973 (10)
New Zealand	26 September 1972	12 February 1974
Nicaragua	22 December 1972	6 November 1973
Niger	6 March 1972	1 September 1972
Nigeria		3 July 1973
Norway		1 August 1973
Oman		2 February 1977 (1) (11)
Pakistan		24 January 1974
Panama	18 January 1972	24 April 1972
Papua New Guinea		15 December 1975 (1)
Paraguay	23 January 1973	5 March 1974
Peru		28 April 1978 (1)
Philippines	23 September 1971	26 March 1973
Poland	23 September 1971	28 January 1975 (1)
Portugal	23 September 1971	15 January 1973
Qatar		26 August 1981 (1)
Republic of Korea		2 August 1973 (12)
Romania	10 July 1972	15 August 1975 (1)
Rwanda	26 June 1972	3 November 1987
Saint Lucia		8 November 1983
Saudi Arabia		14 June 1974 (1) (13)
Senegal	23 September 1971	3 February 1978
Seychelles		29 December 1978
Sierra Leone		20 September 1979
Singapore	21 November 1972	12 April 1978
Solomon Islands		13 April 1982 (14)
South Africa	23 September 1971	30 May 1972 (1)
Spain	15 February 1972	30 October 1972
Sri Lanka		30 May 1978
Sudan		18 January 1979
Suriname		25 November 1975 (15)
Sweden		10 July 1973
Switzerland	23 September 1971	17 January 1978
Syrian Arab Republic		10 July 1980 (1)

States	Date of signature	Date of deposit of instrument of ratification or accession
Thailand		16 May 1978
Togo		9 February 1979
Tonga		21 February 1977
Trinidad and Tobago	9 February 1972	9 February 1972
Tunisia		16 November 1981 (1)
Turkey	5 July 1972	23 December 1975
Uganda		19 July 1982
Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic	23 September 1971	26 January 1973 (1)
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	23 September 1971	19 February 1973 (1)
United Arab Emirates		10 April 1981 (16)
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	23 September 1971	25 October 1973 (17)
United Republic of Tanzania		9 August 1983
United States of America	23 September 1971	1 November 1972
Uruguay		12 January 1977
Vanuatu		6 November 1989
Venezuela	23 September 1971	21 November 1983 (18)
Viet Nam		17 September 1979
Yemen	23 October 1972	29 September 1986
Yugoslavia	23 September 1971	2 October 1972
Zaire		6 July 1977
Zambia		3 March 1987
Zimbabwe		6 February 1989

---

(1) Reservation made with respect to paragraph 1 of article 14 of the Convention.

(2) "In accordance with the provisions of the Convention of 23 September 1971, for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts directed against the Security of Civil Aviation, the Government of the United Republic of Cameroon declares that in view of the fact that it does not have any relations with South Africa and Portugal, it has no obligation toward these two countries with regard to the implementation of the stipulations of the Convention."

(3) The instrument of accession by the Government of the People's Republic of China contains the following declaration: "The Chinese Government declares illegal and null and void the signature and ratification of the above-mentioned Convention by the Taiwan authorities in the name of China".

(4) On 25 April 1991, an instrument was deposited with the Government of the United States by the Government of Czechoslovakia whereby that Government withdraws the reservation made at the time of ratification on 10 August 1973 with regard to paragraph 1 of Article 14 of the Convention. The withdrawal of the reservation took effect on 25 April 1991.

(5) Until a later decision, the Convention will not be applied to the Faroe Islands or to Greenland.

Note: A notification was received by the Government of the United Kingdom from the Government of the Kingdom of Denmark that, with effect from 1 June 1980, Denmark withdraws its reservation, made in the following terms upon ratification, in respect of Greenland:

"Sous la réserve que jusqu'à décision ultérieure la Convention ne s'appliquera pas aux Iles Féroé et au Groënland."

(6) The German Democratic Republic, which ratified the Convention on 9 June 1972, acceded to the Federal Republic of Germany on 3 October 1990.

(7) On 10 January 1990, instruments were deposited with the Government of the United Kingdom and the Government of the United States by the Government of Hungary whereby that Government withdraws the reservation made at the time of ratification on 27 December 1972 with regard to paragraph 1 of Article 14 of the Convention. The withdrawal of the reservation took effect on 10 January 1990.

(8) It is understood that accession to the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts Against the Safety of Civil Aviation, done at Montreal, 1971, does not mean in any way recognition of Israel by the State of Kuwait. Furthermore, no treaty relation will arise between the State of Kuwait and Israel.

(9) "In case of a dispute, all recourse must be made to the International Court of Justice on the basis of the unanimous consent of the parties concerned."

(10) The Convention cannot enter into force for the Netherlands Antilles until thirty days after the date on which the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands shall have notified the depositary Governments that the necessary measures to give effect to the provisions of the Convention have been taken in the Netherlands Antilles.

Note 1: On 11 June 1974, a declaration was deposited with the Government of the United States by the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands stating that in the interim the measures required to implement the provisions of the Convention had been taken in the Netherlands Antilles and, consequently, the Convention will enter into force for the Netherlands Antilles on the thirtieth day after the date of deposit of this declaration.

Note 2: By a Note dated 9 January 1986, the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands informed the Government of the United States that as of 1 January 1986 the Convention was applicable to the Netherlands Antilles (without Aruba) and to Aruba.

(11) Accession to the said Convention by the Government of the Sultanate of Oman does not mean or imply, and shall not be interpreted as recognition of Israel generally or in the context of this Convention.

(12) The accession by the Government of the Republic of Korea to the present Convention does not in any way mean or imply the recognition of any territory or regime which has not been recognized by the Government of the Republic of Korea as a State or Government.

(13) Approval by Saudi Arabia does not mean and could not be interpreted as recognition of Israel generally or in the context of this Convention.

(14) The Solomon Islands attained independence on 7 July 1978; the Instrument of Succession was deposited on 13 April 1982.

(15) Notification of Succession to the Convention was deposited with the Government of the United States on 27 October 1978, by virtue of the extension of the Convention to Suriname by the Kingdom of the Netherlands prior to independence. The Republic of Suriname attained independence on 25 November 1975.

(16) "In accepting the said Convention, the Government of the United Arab Emirates takes the view that its acceptance of the said Convention does not in any way imply its recognition of Israel, nor does it oblige to apply the provisions of the Convention in respect of the said Country."

(17) The Convention is ratified "in respect of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Territories under territorial sovereignty of the United Kingdom as well as the British Solomon Islands Protectorate".

Note: By a Note dated 20 November 1990, the Government of the United Kingdom declared that Anguilla has been included under the ratification of the Convention by that Government with effect from 7 November 1990.

(18) The instrument of ratification by the Government of Venezuela contains the following reservation regarding articles 4, 7 and 8 of the Convention: "Venezuela will take into consideration clearly political motives and the circumstances under which offences described in Article 1 of this Convention are committed, in refusing to extradite or prosecute an offender, unless financial extortion or injury to the crew, passengers, or other persons has occurred".

The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland made the following declaration in a Note dated 6 August 1985 to the Department of State of the Government of the United States:

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland do not regard as valid the reservation made by the Government of the Republic of Venezuela in so far as it purports to limit the obligation under Article 7 of the Convention to submit the case against an offender to the competent authorities of the State for the purpose of prosecution".

With reference to the above declaration by the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Government of Venezuela, in a Note dated 21 November 1985, informed the Department of State of the Government of the United States of the following:

"The reserve made by the Government of Venezuela to Articles 4, 7 and 8 of the Convention is based on the fact that the principle of asylum is contemplated in Article 116 of the Constitution of the Republic of Venezuela. Article 116 reads:

> 'The Republic grants asylum to any person subject to persecution or which finds itself in danger, for political reasons, within the conditions and requirements established by the laws and norms of international law.'

It is for this reason that the Government of Venezuela considers that in order to protect this right, which would be diminished by the application without limits of the said articles, it was necessary to request the formulation of the declaration contemplated in Article 2 of the Law approving the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts Against the Security (sic) of Civil Aviation."

The Government of Italy made the following declaration in a Note dated 21 November 1985 to the Department of State of the Government of the United States:

"The Government of Italy does not consider as valid the reservation formulated by the Government of the Republic of Venezuela due to the fact that it may be considered as aiming to limit the obligation under Article 7 of the Convention to submit the case against an offender to the competent authorities of the State for the purpose of prosecution."

4. Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material, adopted at Vienna on 3 March 1980 (entered into force on 8 February 1987, in accordance with article 19, paragraph 1) a/

State/ organization	Date of signature	Date of deposit of expression of consent to be bound	Entry into force
Argentina	28 February 1986	6 April 1989	6 May 1989 (1)
Australia	22 February 1984	22 September 1987	22 October 1987
Austria	3 March 1980	22 December 1988	21 January 1989
Belgium b/	13 June 1980		
Brazil	15 May 1981	17 October 1985	8 February 1987
Bulgaria	23 June 1981	10 April 1984	8 February 1987 (2)
Canada	23 September 1980	21 March 1986	8 February 1987
China		10 January 1989	9 February 1989 (3)
Czechoslovakia	14 September 1981	23 April 1982	8 February 1987 (4) (21)
Denmark b/	13 June 1980		
Dominican Republic	3 March 1980		
Ecuador	26 June 1986		
EURATOM	13 June 1980 (5)		
Finland	25 June 1981	22 September 1989	22 October 1989
France b/	13 June 1980 (6)		
German Democratic Republic	21 May 1980	5 February 1981	8 February 1987 (7) (22)
Germany, Federal Republic of b/	13 June 1980		
Greece	3 March 1980		
Guatemala	12 March 1980	23 April 1985	8 February 1987 (8)
Haiti	9 April 1980		
Hungary	17 June 1980	4 May 1984	8 February 1987 (9) (21)
Indonesia	3 July 1986	5 November 1986	8 February 1987 (10)
Ireland b/	13 June 1980		
Israel	17 June 1983 (11)		
Italy b/	13 June 1980 (12)		
Japan		28 October 1988	27 November 1988
Liechtenstein	13 January 1986	25 November 1986	8 February 1987
Luxembourg b/	13 June 1980		
Mexico		4 April 1988	4 May 1988
Mongolia	23 January 1986	28 May 1986	8 February 1987 (13) (21)
Morocco	25 July 1980		
Netherlands b/	13 June 1980		

a/ The information concerning this convention is reproduced below as furnished on 17 July 1991 by the secretariat of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

b/ Signed as EURATOM member State.

State/ organization	Date of signature	Date of deposit of expression of consent to be bound	Entry into force
Niger	7 January 1985		
Norway	26 January 1983	15 August 1985	8 February 1987
Panama	18 March 1980		
Paraguay	21 May 1980	6 February 1985	8 February 1987
Philippines	19 May 1980	22 September 1981	8 February 1987
Poland	6 August 1980	5 October 1983	8 February 1987 (14)
Portugal	19 September 1984		
Republic of Korea	29 December 1981	7 April 1982	8 February 1987 (15)
Romania	15 January 1981 (16)		
South Africa	18 May 1981 (17)		
Spain b/	7 April 1986 (18)		
Sweden	2 July 1980	1 August 1980	8 February 1987
Switzerland	9 January 1987	9 January 1987	8 February 1987
Turkey	23 August 1983	27 February 1985	8 February 1987 (19)
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	22 May 1980	25 May 1983	8 February 1987 (20)
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland b/	13 June 1980		
United States of America	3 March 1980	13 December 1982	8 February 1987
Yugoslavia	15 July 1980	14 May 1986	8 February 1987

---

(1) The following reservation was attached to the instrument of ratification of the Convention:

"In accordance with the provisions of Article 17.3 of the Convention, Argentina does not consider itself bound by either of the dispute settlement procedures provided for in Article 17.2 of the Convention."

(2) "The People's Republic of Bulgaria does not consider itself bound by Article 17 (2) of the Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material, according to which any dispute concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention shall, at the request of any Party to such dispute, be submitted to arbitration or referred to the International Court of Justice."

(3) The following reservation was attached to the instrument of accession: "China will not be bound by the two dispute settlement procedures as stipulated in Paragraph 2, Article 17 of the said Convention."

(4) "The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, in accordance with para. 3, Article 17 of the Convention, does not consider itself bound with para. 2 of its Article 17."

(5) "At present the following States are members of the European Atomic Energy Community: Belgium, Denmark, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom.

In signing the Convention, the Community declares that, when it has deposited the instrument of approval or acceptance pursuant to Article 18 and the Convention has entered into force for the Community pursuant to Article 19, Articles 7 to 13 of the Convention will not apply to it.

Furthermore, the Community declares that, because under Article 34 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice only States may be parties in cases before the Court, it can only be bound by the arbitration procedure set out in Article 17 (2)."

(6) "Recalling its statement contained in document CPNM/90 of 25 October 1979, the French Government declares that the jurisdiction referred to in Article 8, paragraph 4 may not be invoked against it, since the criterion of jurisdiction based on involvement in international nuclear transport as the exporting or importing State is not expressly recognized in international law and is not provided for in French national legislation."

"In accordance with Article 17, paragraph 3, France declares that it does not accept the competence of the International Court of Justice in the settlement of the disputes referred to in paragraph 2 of this article, nor that of the President of the International Court of Justice to appoint one or more arbitrators."

Note:

The French statement regarding article 6 bis (document CPNM/87) reads: "... This provision introduces new elements to the field of criminal jurisdiction, necessitating a thorough examination of their legal implications. ..." (document CPNM/90)

(7) "The German Democratic Republic declares in accordance with Article 17, paragraph (3) of the Convention that it does not consider the procedure for the settlement of disputes as provided for in Article 17, paragraph (2) to be binding upon itself."

(8) The instrument of ratification contains the following reservation:

"The Republic of Guatemala does not consider itself bound by any of the dispute settlement procedures set out in pargraph 2 of Article 17 of the Convention, which provide for the submission of disputes to arbitration or their referral to the International Court of Justice for decision."

(9) "The Hungarian People's Republic does not consider itself bound by the provision of para. 2 of Article 17 that any dispute which cannot be settled in the manner prescribed in para. 1 of Article 17 shall, at the request of any party to such dispute, be submitted to arbitration or referred to the International Court of Justice for decision."

(10) The instrument of ratification contains the following reservation:

"The Government of the Republic of Indonesia does not consider itself bound by the provision of Article 17, paragraph 2 of this Convention and takes the position that any dispute relating to the interpretation or application of the Convention may only be submitted to arbitration or to the International Court of Justice with the agreement of all parties to the dispute."

(11) "In accordance with Article 17, paragraph 3, Israel declares that it does not consider itself bound by the dispute settlement procedures provided for in paragraph 2 of Article 17."

(12) "1) In connection with Art. 4.2:

Italy considers that if assurances as to the levels of physical protection described in annex I have not been received in good time the importing State party may take appropriate bilateral steps as far as practicable to assure itself that the transport will take place in compliance with the aforesaid levels.

"2) In connection with Art. 10:

The last words 'through proceedings in accordance with the laws of the State' are to be considered as referring to the whole Article 10."

(13) "... does not consider itself bound by the provisions of para. 2, Article 17 of the Convention, whereby disputes arising out of the interpretation or application of the Convention could be submitted to arbitration or referred to the International Court of Justice for decision at the request of any party to the dispute."

(14) "After having seen and examined the said Convention and the annexes thereto, the Council of State approved them subject to the reservation that the People's Republic of Poland does not consider itself bound by the provisions of Article 17.2 of the Convention; ..."

(15) "The Government of the Republic of Korea does not consider itself bound by the dispute settlement procedures provided for in paragraph 2 of Article 17."

(16) "The Socialist Republic of Romania declares that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of Article 17, paragraph 2 of the Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material, which state that any dispute concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention which cannot be settled by negotiation or by any other peaceful means of settling disputes shall, at the request of any party to such dispute, be submitted to arbitration or referred to the International Court of Justice for decision.

"The Socialist Republic of Romania considers that such disputes can be submitted to arbitration or to the International Court of Justice only with the consent of all parties to the dispute in each individual case.

"In signing the Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material, the Socialist Republic of Romania declares that, in its interpretation, the provisions of Article 18, paragraph 4 refer exclusively to organizations to which the Member States have transferred competence to negotiate, conclude and apply international agreements on their behalf and to exercise the rights and fulfil the responsibilities entailed by such agreements including the right to vote."

(17) "In accordance with Article 17, paragraph 3, the Republic of South Africa declares that it does not consider itself bound by the dispute settlement procedures provided for in paragraph 2 of Article 17."

(18) "... in accordance with paragraph 3 of Article 17 of the Convention, Spain does not consider itself bound by the procedure for the settlement of disputes stipulated in paragraph 2 of Article 17."

(19) "Turkey, in accordance with Article 17, Paragraph 3, of the Convention does not consider itself bound by Article 17, Paragraph 2 of the Convention."

(20) "The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics does not consider itself bound by the provisions of Article 17, paragraph 2 of the Convention that any dispute concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention shall be submitted to arbitration or referred to the International Court of Justice at the request of any party to such dispute."

(21) Indicates that reservation/declaration was subsequently withdrawn.

(22) The Agency was informed by the Federal Republic of Germany by a Note dated 4 October 1990 that the United Germany shall determine its position with regard to the treaties to which the German Democratic Republic was a Party following consultations with the Parties to those treaties and will inform the Agency accordingly.

5. Protocol for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts of Violence at Airports Serving International Civil Aviation, supplementary to the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Civil Aviation, signed at Montreal on 24 February 1988 (entered into force on 6 August 1989) a/

States	Date of signature	Date of deposit of instrument of ratification or accession	Effective date
Argentina	24 February 1988		
Australia		23 October 1990	22 November 1990
Austria	4 July 1989	28 December 1989	27 January 1990
Belgium	15 March 1989		
Brazil	24 February 1988		
Bulgaria	24 February 1988	26 March 1991	25 April 1991
Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic	24 February 1988	1 May 1989	6 August 1989
Cameroon	23 November 1988		
Canada	24 February 1988		
Central African Republic		1 July 1991	31 July 1991
Chile	24 February 1988	15 August 1989	14 September 1989
China	24 February 1988		
Congo	13 April 1989		
Costa Rica	24 February 1988		
Côte d'Ivoire	21 March 1988		
Czechoslovakia	24 February 1988	19 March 1990	18 April 1991
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	11 April 1989		
Denmark (1)	24 February 1988	23 November 1989	23 December 1989
Egypt	24 February 1988		
Ethiopia	24 February 1988		
Finland	16 November 1988		
France (2)	29 March 1988	6 September 1989	6 October 1989
Gabon	20 September 1988		
Germany (3)	24 February 1988		
Ghana	24 February 1988		
Greece	18 April 1988	25 April 1991	25 May 1991
Hungary	24 February 1988	7 September 1988	6 August 1989
Iceland	24 February 1988	9 May 1990	8 June 1990
Indonesia	24 February 1988		

---

a/ The information concerning this convention is reproduced below as furnished on 16 July 1991 by the secretariat of the International Civil Aviation Organization.

States	Date of signature	Date of deposit of instrument of ratification or accession	Effective date
Ireland	29 July 1988		
Israel	24 February 1988		
Italy	24 February 1988	13 March 1990	12 April 1990
Jamaica	24 February 1988		
Jordan	30 September 1988		
Kuwait	24 February 1988	8 March 1989	6 August 1989
Lebanon	24 February 1988		
Liberia	24 February 1988		
Luxembourg	18 May 1989		
Malawi	24 February 1988		
Malaysia	24 February 1988		
Mali		31 October 1990	30 November 1990
Marshall Islands	23 June 1988	30 May 1989	6 August 1989
Mauritius	28 June 1989	17 August 1989	16 September 1989
Mexico	24 February 1988	11 October 1990	10 November 1990
Morocco	8 July 1988		
Netherlands (4)	13 April 1988		
New Zealand	11 April 1989		
Niger	24 February 1988		
Norway	24 February 1988	29 May 1990	28 June 1990
Pakistan	24 February 1988		
Peru	24 February 1988	7 June 1989	6 August 1989
Philippines	25 January 1989		
Poland	24 February 1988		
Portugal	24 February 1988		
Republic of Korea	24 February 1988	27 June 1990	27 July 1990
Romania	24 February 1988		
Saint Lucia		11 June 1990	11 July 1990
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	1 December 1988		
Saudi Arabia	24 February 1988	21 February 1989	6 August 1989
Senegal	24 February 1988		
Spain	2 March 1989	8 May 1991	7 June 1991
Sri Lanka	28 October 1988		
Sweden	24 February 1988	26 July 1990	25 August 1990
Switzerland	24 February 1988	9 October 1990	8 November 1990
Togo	24 October 1988	9 February 1990	11 March 1990
Turkey	24 February 1988	7 July 1989	6 August 1989
Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic	24 February 1988		
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	24 February 1988	31 March 1989	6 August 1989
United Arab Emirates	24 February 1988	9 March 1989	6 August 1989
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	26 October 1988	15 November 1990	15 December 1990

States	Date of signature	Date of deposit of instrument of ratification or accession	Effective date
United States of America	24 February 1988		
Venezuela	24 February 1988		
Yugoslavia	24 February 1988	21 December 1989	20 January 1990
Zaire	24 February 1988		

---

(1) The Government of Denmark made the following reservation at the time of ratification of the Protocol: "Until later decision, the Protocol will not be applied to the Faroe Islands."

(2) The Government of France made the following declaration at the time of signature of the Protocol:

"The French Republic recalls the declaration made at the time of its accession to the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Civil Aviation of 23 September 1971, when it stated that: 'In accordance with Article 14, paragraph 2, the French Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of paragraph 1 of that Article under which any dispute between two or more Contracting States concerning the interpretation or application of this Convention which cannot be settled through negotiation, shall, at the request of one of them, be submitted to arbitration. If within six months from the date of the request for arbitration the Parties are unable to agree on the organization of the arbitration, any one of those Parties may refer the dispute to the International Court of Justice by request in conformity with the Statute of the Court.'

The above declaration is applicable to the Protocol for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts of Violence at Airports Serving International Civil Aviation, Supplementary to the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Civil Aviation of 23 September 1971."

In addition, the following declaration was made by that Government at the time of ratification:

"In depositing its Instrument of Ratification of the Protocol of 24 February 1988 for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts of Violence at Airports Serving International Civil Aviation, Supplementary to the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Civil Aviation done at Montreal on 23 September 1971, the French Republic recalls and confirms the declaration made at the time of its accession to the said Convention, when it stated that: 'In accordance with Article 14, paragraph 2, the French Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of paragraph 1 of that Article under which any

dispute between two or more Contracting States concerning the interpretation or application of this convention which cannot be settled through negotiation shall at the request of one of them, be submitted to arbitration. If within six months from the date of the request for arbitration the Parties are unable to agree on the organization of the arbitration, any one of those Parties may refer the dispute to the International Court of Justice by request in conformity with the Statute of the Court.'

The above declaration is applicable to the Protocol for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts of Violence at Airports Serving International Civil Aviation, Supplementary to the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Civil Aviation of 23 September 1971."

(3) The German Democratic Republic, which ratified the Protocol on 31 January 1989, acceded to the Federal Republic of Germany on 3 October 1990.

(4) The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands made the following interpretative statement at the time of signature of the Protocol:

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands hereby declares that, in the light of the preamble, it understands the provisions laid down in Articles II and III of the Protocol to signify the following:

- only those acts which, in view of the nature of the weapons used and the place where they are committed, cause or are likely to cause incidental loss of life or serious injury among the general public or users of international civil aviation in particular, shall be classed as acts of violence within the meaning of the new paragraph 1 bis (a), as contained in Article II of the Protocol;

- only those acts which, in view of the damage which they cause to buildings or aircraft at the airport or their disruption of the services provided by the airport, endanger or are likely to endanger the safe operation of the airport in relation to international civil aviation, shall be classed as acts of violence within the meaning of the new paragraph 1 bis (b), as contained in Article II of the Protocol."

6. Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Maritime Navigation done at Rome on 10 March 1988 a/

States	Date of signature	Date of deposit of instrument of ratification or accession
Argentina	10 March 1988	
Austria	10 March 1988	28 December 1989
Bahamas	10 March 1988	
Belgium	9 March 1989	
Brazil	10 March 1988	
Brunei Darussalam	3 February 1989	
Bulgaria	10 March 1988	
Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic	7 March 1989	
Canada	10 March 1988	
Chile	10 March 1988 (1)	
China	25 October 1988 (2)	
Costa Rica	10 March 1988	
Czechoslovakia	9 March 1989	
Denmark	26 October 1988	
Ecuador	10 March 1988	
Egypt	16 August 1988	
Finland	18 November 1988	
France	10 March 1988	
Germany		6 November 1990 (3)
Greece	10 March 1988	
Hungary	10 March 1988	9 November 1989
Iraq	17 October 1988 (4)	
Israel	10 March 1988	
Italy	10 March 1988	26 January 1990
Jordan	10 March 1988	
Liberia	10 March 1988	
Morocco	10 March 1988	
Netherlands	23 January 1989	
New Zealand	8 December 1988	
Nigeria	9 September 1988	
Norway	10 March 1988	18 April 1991
Oman		24 September 1990
Philippines	10 March 1988	
Poland	22 November 1988	25 June 1991

---

a/ The information concerning this convention is reproduced below as furnished on 16 July 1991 by the secretariat of the International Maritime Organization.

States	Date of signature	Date of deposit of instrument of ratification or accession
Saudi Arabia	6 March 1989	
Seychelles	24 January 1989	24 January 1989
Spain	28 September 1988	7 July 1989
Sweden	10 March 1988	13 September 1990
Switzerland	10 March 1988	
Trinidad and Tobago		27 July 1989
Turkey	10 March 1988 (5)	
Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic	2 March 1989	
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	2 March 1989	
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	22 September 1988	3 May 1991
United States of America	10 March 1988	

---

(1) The following statement was made at the time of signature of the Convention:

"In connection with the provisions of article 4 of the present Convention, the Government of Chile shall not apply the provisions thereof to incidents that occur in its internal waters and in the waters of Magellan Strait."

(2) The following statement was made at the time of signature of the Convention:

"The People's Republic of China shall not be bound by paragraph 1 of article 16 of said Convention."

(3) The instrument of accession of the German Democratic Republic was accompanied by the following reservation:

"In accordance with article 16, paragraph 2, of the Convention the German Democratic Republic declares that it does not consider itself bound by article 16, paragraph 1, of the Convention."

(4) The following reservation was made at the time of signature of the Convention:

"This signature does not in any way imply recognition of Israel or entry into any relationship with it."

(5) Reservation to the effect that Turkey does not consider itself bound by all of the provisions of article 16, paragraph 1.

7. Protocol for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Fixed Platforms located on the Continental Shelf, done at Rome on 10 March 1988 a/

States	Date of signature	Date of deposit of instrument of ratification or accession
Argentina	10 March 1988	
Austria		28 December 1989
Bahamas	10 March 1988	
Belgium	9 March 1989	
Brazil	10 March 1988	
Brunei Darussalam	3 February 1989	
Bulgaria	10 March 1988	
Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic	2 March 1989	
Canada	10 March 1988	
Chile	10 March 1988	
China	25 October 1988 (1)	
Costa Rica	10 March 1988	
Czechoslovakia	9 March 1989	
Denmark	26 October 1988	
Ecuador	10 March 1988	
Egypt	16 August 1988	
France	10 March 1988	
Germany		6 November 1990 (2)
Greece	10 March 1988	
Hungary	10 March 1988	9 November 1989
Iraq	17 October 1988 (3)	
Israel	10 March 1988	
Italy	10 March 1988	26 January 1990
Jordan	10 March 1988	
Liberia	10 March 1988	
Morocco	10 March 1988	
Netherlands	23 January 1989	
New Zealand	8 December 1988	
Nigeria	9 September 1988	
Norway	10 March 1988	18 April 1991
Oman		24 September 1990
Philippines	10 March 1988	
Poland	22 November 1988	25 June 1991

---

a/ The information concerning this convention is reproduced below as furnished on 16 July 1991 by the secretariat of the International Maritime Organization.

States	Date of signature	Date of deposit of instrument of ratification or accession
Saudi Arabia	6 March 1989	
Seychelles	24 January 1989	24 January 1989
Spain	28 September 1988	7 July 1989
Sweden	10 March 1988	13 September 1990
Switzerland	27 February 1989	
Trinidad and Tobago		27 July 1989
Turkey	10 March 1988 (4)	
Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic	2 March 1989	
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	2 March 1989	
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	22 September 1988	3 May 1991
United States of America	10 March 1988	

---

(1) The following statement was made at the time of signature of the Protocol:

"The People's Republic of China shall not be bound by paragraph 1 of article 16 of the Convention of Maritime Navigation."

(2) The instrument of accession of the German Democratic Republic was accompanied by the following reservation:

"In accordance with article 16, paragraph 2, of the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Maritime Navigation, the provisions of which shall also apply mutatis mutandis to the Protocol according to article 1, paragraph 1, of the Protocol, the German Democratic Republic declares that it does not consider itself bound by article 16, paragraph 1 of the Convention as regards the Protocol."

(3) The following reservation was made at the time of signature of the Protocol:

"This signature does not in any way imply recognition of Israel or entry into any relationship with it."

(4) Reservation to the effect that Turkey does not consider itself bound by all of the provisions of article 16, paragraph 1 of the Convention.

8. Convention on the Marking of Plastic Explosives for the Purpose of Detection, signed at Montreal on 1 March 1991 a/

States	Date of signature	Date of deposit of instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession	Effective date
Afghanistan	1 March 1991		
Argentina	1 March 1991		
Belgium	1 March 1991		
Bolivia	1 March 1991		
Brazil (1)	1 March 1991		
Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic	1 March 1991		
Canada	1 March 1991		
Chile	1 March 1991		
Costa Rica	1 March 1991		
Côte d'Ivoire	1 March 1991		
Czechoslovakia	1 March 1991		
Denmark	1 March 1991		
Ecuador	1 March 1991		
Egypt	1 March 1991		
France	1 March 1991		
Gabon	1 March 1991		
Germany	1 March 1991		
Ghana	1 March 1991		
Greece	1 March 1991		
Guinea	1 March 1991		
Guinea-Bissau	1 March 1991		
Israel	1 March 1991		
Kuwait	1 March 1991		
Lebanon	1 March 1991		
Madagascar	1 March 1991		
Mali	1 March 1991		
Mauritius	1 March 1991		
Mexico	1 March 1991		
Norway	1 March 1991		
Pakistan	1 March 1991		
Peru (1)	1 March 1991		
Republic of Korea	1 March 1991		

---

a/ The information concerning this Convention is reproduced below as furnished on 16 July 1991 by the secretariat of the International Civil Aviation Organization.

States	Date of signature	Date of deposit of instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession	Effective date
Senegal	1 March 1991		
Switzerland	1 March 1991		
Togo	1 March 1991		
Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic	1 March 1991		
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	1 March 1991		
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	1 March 1991		
United States of America	1 March 1991		
Honduras (1)	26 March 1991		
Bulgaria	26 March 1991		
Turkey (1)	7 May 1991		

(1) Reservation: Does not consider itself bound by article XI, paragraph 1, of the Convention.